REPORT RESUMES

ED 016 138 VT 004 320

RESTORATION OF YOUTH THROUGH TRAINING, A FINAL REPORT.

BY- SULLIVAN, CLYDE E. MANDELL, WALLACE

WAKOFF RESEARCH CENTER, STATEN ISLAND, N.Y.

PUB DATE APR 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$1.75 HC-$16.44 409P.

DESCRIPTORS- *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION, CORRECTIVE INSTITUTIONS, DRUG ADDICTION, EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES, REMEDIAL READING, *VOCATIONAL FOLLOWUP, MALES, DATA PROCESSING, EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, CONTROL GROUPS, RESEARCH PROJECTS, INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS, JOB PLACEMENT, EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE, YOUNG ADULTS, *SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT, *VOCATIONAL ADJUSTMENT, *PRISONERS, REHABILITATION COUSELING, RYT, RIKERS ISLAND, NEW YORK CITY,

THE PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT WAS TO PROVIDE VOCATIONAL TRAINING FOR A SAMPLE OF YOUNG JAIL INMATES ON RIKERS ISLAND IN NEW YORK CITY AND TO EVALUATE THEIR SUBSEQUENT PERFORMANCE AND ADJUSTMENT UPON RELEASE. OF 264 INMATES SELECTED UPON THE BASIS OF TESTING AND OTHER CRITERIA, 137 WERE RANDOMLY ASSIGNED TO AN EXPERIMENTAL AND 127 TO A CONTROL GROUP. THE CONTROL GROUP FOLLOWED ORDINARY JAIL ROUTINE, AND THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP RECEIVED PUNCHED-CARD DATA-PROCESSING MACHINE TRAINING, REMEDIAL READING INSTRUCTION, INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING, POST-JAIL SUPPORTIVE SERVICE, AND JOB PLACEMENT ASSISTANCE. THE PROJECT WAS BESET BY PROBLEMS INCLUDING INSTITUTIONAL SPONSORSHIP, COMPLETE STAFF TURNOVER, FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES, AND MISUNDERSTANDING. DESPITE THESE DIFFICULTIES, THE STUDY SHOWED EVIDENCE THAT A VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM IN JAIL COUPLED WITH POST-RELEASE SERVICES DOES MAKE A DIFFERENCE IN JOB PERFORMANCE AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS FAVORED THE FORMER GROUP IN (1) NON-RETURN TO JAIL, (2) NON-RETURN TO JAIL EVEN IF ADDICTED TO DRUGS, (3) NEW JOB OPPORTUNITIES UPON RELEASE, (4) SOCIAL MOBILITY AS EVIDENCED BY JOB LEVEL, (5) REDUCTION IN INCIDENCE OF PHYSICAL LABOR JOBS, (6) INCREASE IN JOBS WITH PROMOTION POTENTIAL, (7) INCREASE IN JOBS WHERE JOB TRAINING WAS AVAILABLE, AND (8) INCREASED TENURE WITH FIRMS HIRING INMATES UPON RELEASE. APPENDIXES INCLUDE THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS, TABULAR DATA, A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE READING PROGRAM, AND WORKING PAPERS PREPARED BY STAFF MEMBERS. (JM)

ED016138

RESTORATION OF YOUTH THROUGH TRAINING

A Final Report

VT004320

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RESTORATION OF YOUTH THROUGH TRAINING

A Final Report

Clyde E. Sullivan and
Wallace Mandell

Mrs. Frances H. Kohan
Editorial Associate

Submitted to
Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research
United States Department of Labor

April 1967

The material in this report was prepared under Contract MDTA 18-64 with the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research, U. S. Department of Labor, under the authority of Title I of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended. Researchers undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is particularly difficult to identify everyone who should be acknowledged for their contribution to the Restoration of Youth through Training project. Although the authors of this report were involved as consultants fairly early in the life of the project, they were not engaged in the operational aspects of the program.

After the operational phases of the program a staff of six people headed by Dr. Clyde E. Sullivan and Dr. Wallace Mandell began to gather the follow-up materials. This staff included Mrs. Frances Kohan, Research Associate, who worked much beyond her part-time responsibility editing materials and data; Mrs. Elaine Goodman Shoenfield, Research Secretary, was a tower of strength in reorganizing the original RYT files and fitting all the bits and pieces of information from interviews and questionnaires, into meaningful individual case folders; Mlles. Caryl Heller and Helen Kozin, as Research Assistants, who carried on the tedious task of searching through official agency records and files, checking the demographic and background base-line data. Mr. Martin Eisdorfer, a former member of the RYT staff, was repeatedly helpful in providing information about past training activities of the project staff. Mr. Sam Slotkin, was a valuable source of information about job placement and community organization activities of the project.

RYT would not have been possible without the vision, persistence and cooperation of former Commissioner Anna M. Kross, New York City Department of Correction. Her determination to improve the lot of offenders was an inspiration to all. Her successor, Commissioner George F. McGrath, has continued the administrative support with critical awareness of research needs. Special thanks are due to Department of Correction staff: Mr. Anthony Principe (Chief of Operations), Mr. Sam Badian (Deputy Director of Operations), Dr. Francis de Bilio (Chief of Rehabilitation), Deputy Warden Milton Roth (Deputy Warden in command of the Adolescent Division of the New York City Correctional Institution), Warden Frances R. Buono (Reception Center at Rikers Island) and Mr. Harold Wildstein (Assistant Director of Rehabilitation at Rikers Island). These people were unremitting in their efforts to smooth and work out the almost daily administrative problems. The patience and interest of many line Correction Officers sustained the study at critical points. This was particularly true of Mr. Leonard Roberts, who was the Correction Officer responsible for the experimental group of trainees.

Commissioner John Quinn of the New York City Parole Commission provided generous support and access to information that was absolutely essential to the success of the follow-up study. His staff provided critical data about the lives of the trainees in the community and actively worked to help the RYT staff in many important ways. The collection of follow-up information would have been impossible if it were not for the knowledge and dedicated persistence of Mr. Ben Malcolm, Deputy Chief Parole Officer.

Follow-up interviews with the employers who had hired RYT subjects were handled by an unusual part-time staff. They were: Mmes. Joan Brodax, Evelyn Gleimer, Mimi Jed, Mollie Kolatch, Muriel Marcuvitz, Fran Miller, Hannah Rigler, and Judith Skutch. This group of women originally came to the Research Center as volunteer job developers on another project. Several had fairly extensive experience in contacting businessmen in the community. This prior experience was very pertinent and helpful to RYT. The enthusiasm of this group and their dedication and genuine interest in the boys and the goals of the project provided a sustaining and refreshing experience throughout and helped produce an extra bonus in a store of anecdotes and observations only partially tapped in this report.

The follow-up interviews with relatives and the boys themselves were also handled by recruiting a part-time staff. We are indebted to Mr. Clifford Clemmons, President of The Counseleers, a social organization of professional probation and parole officers and social workers in the New York City area, for coordinating and directing the work done by The Counseleers. These men and women did a thoroughly competent job in acquiring these interviews, many of which were conducted under trying conditions. In several instances, families of subjects were located when official agencies had been unable to contact them. Although the subcultural population represented by the study group tends to stay in the same general neighborhood, they are inclined to change addresses. When this occurs, they are reluctant to be found and their society tends to protect them, making it unusually difficult to trace them. Moreover, even when they have been found many are reluctant to identify themselves and submit to an interview. Even with such handicaps, the persistence and ingenuity of these interviewers resulted in obtaining 73% of the interviews with relatives (179 out of a possible 246), and 65% of the interviews with the boys themselves (159 out of a possible 246).

A number of agencies throughout the City cooperated in making resources available for trainees. Of particular note were the efforts of the New York City YMCA in providing shelter for many boys as they were released from jail, and the New York City Housing Authority for space to house field-offices from which services would be provided to youngsters in the free community.

The initial agreement of the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation and Research of the Manpower Administration in the U. S. Department of Labor to support the RYT project was a major pioneering decision. The counsel and longrange perspective by OMPER staff were as important to the life of the project as any money that they provided.

Dr. Howard Rosen, Assistant Director for Manpower Research at OMPER and Mr. William Paschell, Chief of Special Manpower Problems, Research Group, were with the Project from beginning to end. Their careful review, extraordinary patience, and commitment to finding answers on which better decisions could be based provided a continuity which was vital.

The original conception of RYT and the initial research design and proposal were the work of Dr. Sol Chaneles. He also must be credited for the drive and energy required to move the project from an idea stage to reality. The value of research questionnaires, reports and written observations developed by various staff persons who were involved in the early phases of the project should also be recognized. A complete listing of names of staff may be found on the following page.

Clyde E. Sullivan
Wallace Mandell

Staten Island, New York
April, 1967

PROJECT STAFF

DURING PERIOD OF

November 1963 - July 1965

Principal Investigator	Dr. Sol Chaneles (4-16-64 to 3-23-65)
Principal Investigator	Dr. Wallace Mandell (3-23-65 to 7-15-65)
Associate Project Director	Dr. Gerald Ehrlich (4-15-64 to 7-1-64) Mr. Jacob Ross (7-1-64 to 11-4-64) Mr. Jay Bostwick (11-1-64 to 11-27-64) Mr. Arno Safier (11-4-64 to June 1965)
Administrator	Dr. Harry Nadler
Associate Research Director	Mr. Jacob Ross
Research Assoc. Voc. Placement	Mr. Lou Spindell
Research Assoc. for Social Services Coordination	Mr. William S. Walker
Research Social Worker	Mr. Edward Ortiz
Social Investigator	Mr. Clifton Bullard
Consultant Community Organization	Mr. Sam Slotkin
Job Placement Supervisor	Mr. John J. Cox
Job Placement Clerk	Mr. Joseph C. Young
Instructor	Mr. Felix V. Cuestas, Jr.
Research Assistants	Mr. Stuart Cohen Mr. Martin Eisdorfer Mr. Robert Falcier Mr. E. Paul Kuschner Mr. Herman Melli Mr. Leo Ross Mr. Joseph M. Solomon Miss Donna Whiteman
Secretarial Staff	Miss Barbara E. Callender Miss Lorraine C. Grazzette Miss Soffer E. Smith

DURING PERIOD OF

April 1966 - December 1966

Principal Investigator & Director	Dr. Clyde E. Sullivan
Principal Investigator	Dr. Wallace Mandell
Research Associate	Mrs. Frances Kohan
Research Secretary	Mrs. Elaine Goodman Shoenf
Research Assistants	Miss Caryl Heller Miss Helen Kozin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. HISTORY OF THE PROJECT.......................... 1

II. THE JAIL AND THE WORLD OF WORK.......................... 16

- The Correctional Institution for Men on Rikers Island.......................... 16
- How Many Jails are There.......................... 17
- How Many People are in Jail.......................... 17
- Public Attitudes Toward the Jail.......................... 18
- The Adolescent Division at Rikers Island.......................... 22
- Problems of Young Adults in Jail.......................... 23
- Educational Opportunities for Young Offenders... 31
- The Psychological Impact of Imprisonment.......................... 32
- A Summary Statement.......................... 33

III. THE RYT EXPERIMENT.......................... 37

- Theoretical Bases for Assuming a Relationship Between Crime & Problems of Employment.......................... 37
- Self-Management & Occupational Role.......................... 47
- Implications for Design & Focus of RYT.......................... 51
- Implications for the Type of Training to be Given.......................... 53
- Summary & Restatement in Research Terms.......................... 55

IV. MAKING THE PROJECT OPERATIONAL.......................... 58

- Research Design.......................... 58
- Selection of the Study Group.......................... 59
- Subjects Providing Data for Each Measure.......................... 61
- Sources of Attrition in the Experimental Group.. 62
- Evaluation Instruments.......................... 62
- Data Analysis.......................... 62
- The IBM Training Program.......................... 64
- Curriculum Outline.......................... 65
- Remedial Reading.......................... 67
- Guidance & Counseling.......................... 70
- Self-Management.......................... 72
- Job Placement.......................... 73
- Social Service Coordination.......................... 76
- Termination of Services.......................... 83
- Difficulties in Maintaining Contact With Trainees.......................... 83

Chapter Page

V. FINDINGS.. 86

Who goes to jail: characteristics of the general population of inmates in the New York City Reformatory at Rikers Island.......... 86
Place of Birth & Ethnic Group Membership of Reformatory Inmates.......................... 89
Grade Level Achievement in School.............. 89
Grade Level Achievement and IQ Scores........... 93
Participation in the World of Work.............. 93
Families on Welfare............................. 108
Previous Criminal History....................... 108
Comparison of Characteristics of RYT Subjects and General Population of Admissions to New York City Reformatory............ 109
Comparison of Experimental & Control Groups on Demographic and Background Data....... 116
Criminal History................................ 125
Offenses.. 126
Parole "marks" as a Measure of Seriousness of Offense History................. 127
Educational Background.......................... 127
Differences in Birthplace of Parent or Relative. 128
Comparison of Pre-Training Scores on Objective Tests.................................. 129
The Reduction of Recidivism in RYT.............. 135
The Reduction of Recidivism Among Drug Users.... 137
The Effect of RYT on Subjects From Different Educational Background................ 142
The Effect of RYT on Return to Jail as Measured by Changes in Predicted Outcomes....... 145
The Effectiveness of RYT in Developing New Opportunities in the World of Work.......... 148
The Effect of Training & Placement on Social Mobility................................. 153
Social and Environmental Problems............... 160
Nature of the Job Market for Young Offenders.... 161
Ethnic Identity & Promotional Opportunity....... 166
Self-Confidence & Its Effect on Recidivism...... 171
The Contribution of RYT to Self-Confidence...... 172
Handicap of Prison Record....................... 178
Job Placement................................... 179
How Did Employers Come to Contact the Boys They Hired.............................. 181
Job Stability & Employer Satisfaction........... 183
Earnings.. 189
Inmate Reasons for Entering the RYT Program..... 189
Remedial Reading: Results & Test Scores......... 190
Citizens Advisory Committee..................... 193
Bonding... 199
Relationships With Other Agencies............... 200
Social Restoration Through Vocational Education. 201

Chapter Page

VI. PERSPECTIVES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.................. 203

Why Haven't Jails Changed........................ 206
A Brief Historical Perspective................. 211
Implications for Developing Treatment Programs in Jail................................ 216
Implications in RYT for the Design of Future Research............................. 223
The Need for a Pilot Study in Planning RYT Types of Research.......................... 228
Pilot Systems Analysis......................... 229
Pilot Staff Job Market Evaluation.............. 230
Implications in RYT Relevant to Placing Boys in the Job Market................ 231
Work With the Community........................ 236
Secondary Effects of Training Within the Jail.. 237
Use of Jail Inmates as Training Cadre.......... 238
Remedial Education............................. 239
Implications for New Programs to Replace Jails................................. 242
Implications for Further Research.............. 247

APPENDIX A FORMS USED TO GATHER INFORMATION REPORTED ON IN THE BODY OF THE REPORT...................... 251

APPENDIX B ADDITIONAL TABLES............................. 309

APPENDIX C READING LABORATORY............................ 335

APPENDIX D WORKING PAPERS & MEMORANDA PREPARED BY STAFF MEMBERS DURING THE LIFE OF THE PROJECT.. 337

APPENDIX E A WORKING PAPER ON SOURCES OF JOB ASPIRATION & JOB CHOICE........................ 380

Tables in Chapters I, II, III, IV & V

Table	Title	Page
1	Educational Attainments of Males in Jail...........	29
1A	Sample in Each Cycle of Training...................	59
1B	Distribution of Sample According to Cycle..........	61
1C	No. of Trainees Completing Training................	62
2	Ethnic Group Membership & Place of Birth...........	88
3	Highest Grade Completed & Places of Birth..........	90
4	Ethnic Group Membership & Highest Grade Completed..	92
5	Beta IQ Scores & Highest Grade Completed...........	94
6	Highest Grade Completed & Employment Status at Time of Arrest..	95
7	Highest Grade Completed & Classification of Last Employment..	96
8	Highest Grade Completed & Earnings at Last Employment..	97
9	Ethnic Group Membership & Earnings at Last Job.....	98
10	No. of Families of Inmates on Welfare & Ethnic Group Membership....................................	99
11	No. of Prior Convictions & Ethnic Group Membership of Inmates..	100
12	Ethnic Group Membership & Patterns of Offense......	101
13	No. of Prior Convictions Drug Use..................	102
14	Ethnic Group Membership & Age of First Drug Use....	103
15	Age at First Drug Use & Type Drug Used.............	104
16	Age at First Drug Use & Frequency at Arrest........	105
17	Age at First Drug Use & Average Daily Cost.........	106
18	Employment Status of Inmates With History of Drug Use..	107
19	Comparison of Subjects & Sample of General Admissions to N.Y.C. Reformatory in 1964...........	110

Table	Title	Page
20	Place of Birth of Subjects	117
21	Length of Residence in N.Y.C. of Subjects	117
22	Ethnic Group Membership of Subjects	118
23	Religious Affiliation of Subjects	118
24	Home Living Arrangements of Subjects	119
25	Occupations of Fathers of Subjects	120
26	Classification of Occupations of Fathers	120
27	Classification of Occupations of Mothers	121
28	Highest Grade Completed by Subjects	121
29	Type of High School Attended by Subjects	122
30	Present School Status of Subjects	122
31	Occupation Held by Subjects Immediately Prior to Incarceration	123
32	Classification of Occupation Held by Subjects Immediately Prior to Incarceration	123
33	Longest Duration of Employment Prior to Incarceration as Reported by Subjects	124
34	Comparison of Earnings at Last Employment Prior to Incarceration	124
35	Subjects With a Family Court Record	130
36	Subjects with Youthful Offender Record	130
37	Subjects With Juvenile Aid Record	130
38	Misdemeanors from Age 16 for Subjects	131
39	Felonies from Age 16 for Subjects	131
40	Arrest Record for Subjects from Age 16	132
41	Comparison of Offenses Leading to Incarceration of Experimental & Control Subjects	132
42	Comparison of Marks Given During Incarceration for Experimentals and Controls	133
43	Birthplace of Relative Responsible for Subjects	133

Table Title Page

44 Comparison of Experimentals & Controls Before Training on Objective Tests........................ 134

45 Subjects Returned to Jail or Prison Within 12 Months After Release From Rikers Island............ 136

46 History of Drug Use Reported by Subjects & Type of Drug Used.................................... 138

47 Age at Which Drugs First Used as Reported by Subjects.. 139

48 Frequency With Which Drugs Used at Time of First Drug Use as Reported by Subjects...................... 139

49 Frequency of Drug Use Just Prior to Incarceration as Reported by Subjects........................... 140

50 Recidivism of Experimentals & Controls Using Drugs.. 141

51 Recidivism of Experimentals & Controls Non-Drug Users.. 141

52 Recidivism of Experimentals & Controls With Vocational High School Background.................. 143

53 Recidivism of Experimentals & Controls With Academic High School Background.................... 144

54 Multiple Correlations Between Recidivism & Six RYT Demographic Variables.......................... 145

55 Comparison of Actual & Predicted Recidivism of Subjects With High Predicted Recidivism Scores...... 146

56 Comparison of Actual & Predicted Recidivism of Subjects With Low Predicted Recidivism Scores....... 147

57 No. of Employees in Electronic Data Processing in Organizations Hiring Subjects as Reported by Employers.. 149

58 Employer Response to Question Whether Trainee Hired to Perform was Related to IBM Operations...... 150

59 Employer Response to Question Whether Training Received was Relevant for Work Hired to Perform..... 150

60 Extent Which RYT Training Influenced Hiring Decision Reported by Employers.......................... 152

Table	Title	Page
61	No. of New Jobs Developed for RYT & Existing Job Openings Reported by Employers	152
62	Reasons for Hiring Subjects as Reported by Employers	153
63	Classification of Entry Level Jobs for Subjects as Reported by Employers	153
64	Occupational Classification of RYT Jobs as Reported by Employers	154
65	Comparison by Employers of Subjects with Average Candidates for Jobs	156
66	Entering Requirements of RYT Jobs as Reported by Employers	159
67	Length of Residence at Current Home as Reported by Subjects	161
68	No. of Different Residences in Past 5 Years of Subjects as Reported by Relative or Parent	161
69	Rating of Employers of Jobs Held by Subjects as to Permanency	163
70	Usual Reasons for Job Turnover as Reported by Employers	163
71	Qualifications for Logical Promotional Step for Subjects as Reported by Employers	163
72	Ethnic Group Membership of Subjects & Employer Report of Chances for Promotion	167
73	Ethnic Group Membership of Subjects & Employer Evaluations as to Whether Subject Qualified for Promotion to Next Logical Step	168
74	Formal Testing Program in Companies Employing Subjects as Reported by Employer	168
75	Necessity for "Break-In" Period as Reported by Employer	169
76	Type of Supervision for Jobs as Reported by Employers	170
77	Skills that may be Acquired on Job by Employers	171

Table Title Page

78 Comparison of Recidivist & Non-Recidivist Self-Ratings on the Likelihood of Remaining Out of Jail by Subjects.......... 173

79 Comparison of Experimentals & Controls Self-Ratings of Likelihood of Remaining out of Jail.......... 174

80 Salaries Desired by Experimentals & Controls.......... 174

81 Chances of Getting a Good Job as Rated by Experimentals & Controls.......... 175

82 Response of Experimentals & Controls to Question of What Preparations are Being Made by Subject to Get a Desirable Job.......... 175

83 Estimates by Trainees of Chances of Securing Good Jobs Prior to Training.......... 176

84 Evaluation by Recidivist & Non-Recidivist Trainees as to Whether Training Improved Chances of Getting a Better Job.......... 176

85 Evaluation by Recidivist & Non-Recidivist Trainees as to Whether Training Affected Chances of Staying Out of Jail.......... 177

86 Report on Trainees on Most Helpful Aspects of RYT as Reported.......... 177

87 Difficulties Encountered by Subjects in Looking for Work After Being in Jail as Reported by Parents & Relatives.......... 178

88 Type of Organization Hiring Subjects as Reported by Employers.......... 180

89 No. of Employees in Organizations Hiring Subjects as Reported by Employers.......... 180

90 Type of Business Activity Hiring Subjects as Reported by Employers.......... 181

91 Sources of Referral for Employment of Subjects as Reported by Employers.......... 182

92 A Comparison of Experimentals & Controls and Job Stability.......... 185

93 Reason for Entering RYT Program as Reported by Trainees.......... 190

94 Mean Scores on Psychological Tests Before & After Training and Remedial Reading Instruction.......... 191

CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

This report relates the experience and findings of RYT (Restoration of Youth through Training), a research project financed by the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation and Research (OMPER) of the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

RYT began in December 1963 as a joint venture of the City College of New York and the New York City Department of Correction. In general, the project was designed to provide special vocational training for a sample of young men serving time in the New York City jail and to study their subsequent performance and adjustment upon release.

From a population of over 3000 male inmates, 16 to 21 years old, committed to the New York City Department of Correction during an 18 month period, 300 young men

16 1 1 5

who passed a basic skills examination which indicated that they were capable of learning data-processing techniques were selected to be subjects of the study. This sample was randomly divided into control and experimental groups. Controls followed ordinary jail routines. Experimentals received training on IBM punched-card data-processing machines and remedial reading help. Group discussion and individual counseling services were set up in the jail to anticipate and discuss post-release personal adjustment problems. Job finding and placement as well as other supportive services were provided after release to help experimental subjects manage the transition from jail and to foster entry into contributing roles as members of the free community. After the project had been in operation several months, an accumulation of operational and administrative difficulties caused City College to withdraw from the venture. This left the Department of Correction with several critical problems. The Department did not want to take responsibility for fiscal management of the research. Moreover, there was a need for a community base outside the Department and for relationships within the community that partially were denied Correction because of traditional social attitudes that tend to isolate the jail and its clients. Finally, there was a continuing need for the experience in research management previously supplied by the College. Faced by such problems, the Department approached the Wakoff Research Center of the Staten Island Mental Health Society for help.

Some of the most pressing problems requiring immediate solution were concerned with staff turnover and staff morale. The bases for establishing salary levels within the project were not systematic. Many salaries were not competitive with those outside civil service positions. Moreover, monthly checks for all of the staff had been delayed several times because the project's bank balance was depleted and vouchers for reimbursement from Federal funds were processed slowly. The Mental Health Society met these problems by establishing an overall salary policy, raising salaries to be competitive wherever this was appropriate, and advanced funds from its own monies to cover daily operating expenses and monthly salary checks.

Some difficulties seemed to emerge as a result of the fact that project staff had very little experience with the personnel and requirements of a jail. It was hard for them to adapt their procedures to operate in a facility primarily designed to restrict and inhibit "clients" rather than to educate and stimulate them.

Because project staff was unfamiliar with the prevailing frames of reference in the jail, they often were bewildered by the behavior and attitudes of both custodial staff and inmates. Similarly, Department of Correction personnel had little experience with research and researchers in their midst. Inevitable conflicts arose with regard to use of space, program schedules, movement of inmates, movement of personnel, etc. Without a common frame of experience, both sides tended to perceive the other as being somewhat whimsical and arbitrary. Correctional staff had little faith in the researchers' commitment to the security requirements of the institution. On the other hand, the researchers tended to feel that there had been a steady erosion of research plans because correctional staff really were not interested in the experiment.

In an effort to provide some perspective and to reduce the strains in this situation, the Mental Health Society hired several experienced consultants in correctional psychology and vocational training and held an extended series of meetings in which both correctional and research staff met with the consultants.

Another problem that loomed large in the early days of the project was the hesitancy of a number of community agencies to concern themselves seriously with a program originating in the jail. As an already established mental health service in the community, the Staten Island Mental Health Society was able to call upon many previously established relationships to facilitate the cooperation of official and voluntary agencies in providing relevant services for RYT.

Finally, there was the problem of providing the IBM equipment for the purposes of the study. A full time Chief of Research recently had been appointed by the Department of Correction central office staff. A program was underway to stimulate an improved and expanded use of IBM machines in the Department. It was assumed that excess time on the machines would be available for an inmate training program. Further, it was hoped that such a vigorous and rewarding interaction could be created between training needs and Department needs for evaluative and statistical information that a new data processing division could be established at Rikers Island and increased Departmental expenditures for such equipment could be justified. With the expectation that there would be a brief period of demonstration and development, but that costs shortly would be borne by expanded use, the IBM company provided equipment for beginning the project. However, the Department of Correction was unable to expand rapidly in its use of data-processing equipment to a point where the cost of the machines could be absorbed. Thus, after a reasonable lapse of time, when the IBM company presented a bill for rentals, there was no money available to make payment. Several of these bills had accumulated by the time that Staten Island Mental Health Society entered the project. One of the first steps taken by the Society was to try to resolve this dilemma. The final outcome was that IBM generously donated the $14,000 cost of equipment used for the study.

Administrative difficulties are not unusual in new programs of this sort which involve major changes in stable social institutions. In the final assessment, experience acquired in working through such problems is frequently counted as a positive gain in knowledge to be passed on to others. Therefore, while the problems outlined above were serious, some of the difficulties had been partially anticipated in general terms and most of the losses to the project could be assimilated without damage to major objectives. However, from a research point of view, a much more important issue remained. It was apparent that the basic integrity of the research design was threatened at two critical points. First, there was a question as to whether the random assignment of subjects was being protected. Second, there was a question as to whether the field data necessary for evaluation of outcomes could be collected with the procedures and personnel available. Staff and consultants were assigned to evaluate the possibility of meeting scientific criteria.

As these earlier problems were handled, new problems arose to take their place. The entire life of the project was a stormy, continuous series of crises and pending disasters. Morale was unevenly affected by these experiences. Some staff members seemed to be energized by the conflicts - others were immobilized because of them. Staff turnover was stabilized for a short period of time by salary adjustments and regular pay checks, but other influences undercutting morale were less manageable and staffing continued to be a problem throughout the study. In one eight month period, for example, four different men were appointed and worked briefly as Project Director.

Finally, actually only a few months before the initially scheduled closing date, a major crisis arose which deprived the project of key leadership and threatened to halt the entire program. This was resolved by a decision that the Wakoff Research Center and Staten Island Mental Health Society would assume direct responsibility for completion of the project. This decision was prompted, in large part, by the fact that despite the many difficulties that had been encountered, basic elements in the research design were relatively intact, while much irreplaceable data and experience would have been lost. In addition, it had become increasingly obvious to the researchers and to the staff of the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation and Research who were intimately involved in these decisions that many of the most frustrating elements in the difficulties that were being encountered were a direct outgrowth of the conditions under study and the character of the problem that lay at the core of the research.

Despite a great amount of argument about the therapeutic and social value of work, and the necessity of vocational training for criminals in jail, there had been no previous definitive, direct confrontation of many of the central issues. Education and vocational training had been tried in jail settings, but usually without research evaluations, and no one had seriously tried to test the proposition that the jail might be used to create a practical, effective entry to the world of work for young adults sentenced to jail.

Responsibility for defining the problems of employment for ex-prisoners and responsibility for determining solutions has never been adequately settled by public agencies at any level of government. In fact, because of the lack of integration and the tendency of each agency to pursue its own objectives, a mass of administrative rules and regulations effectively exclude many ex-inmates from any service at all after they have left the jail. Routine interpretations of current restrictions regularly exclude a majority of sentenced prisoners in jail from help that they seriously need to get good jobs.

Even at the federal level, agencies charged with carrying out research in prevention and control of crime and delinquency have focused on other dimensions of these problems. Federal agencies concerned with labor issues rarely have been able to take a direct or sustained interest in problems of work for released offenders because of jurisdictional boundaries and because of more general concerns with the economic well being of the nation as a whole.

The final report could not be completed in July 1965 as originally projected, because nearly one-third of the subjects were still in jail. The rate of release had been slower than anticipated. Follow-up data were incomplete. Of those subjects who had been released, only a few had been in the community for long

(D) [illegible] up

enough time to allow recidivism and vocational adjustment to occur in the community. Therefore, it was necessary to wait until sufficient numbers of subjects had been freed long enough to provide a real test for the hypotheses of the study and to obtain complete follow-up data. Since all aspects of the program which were to take place in jail had been completed by June 1965, all activities were temporarily suspended shortly after completion of the training cycles.

Data gathering activities were resumed eight months later in March 1966, under new direction and with an entirely new staff.

Some unfortunate losses were occasioned by this delay. The original staff had moved on to other jobs. The records they left behind, of course, only partially reflect the experience and insight they had gathered along the way. For the experimental group the continuity between training and actual entry into a job was broken for a large number of subjects who had completed training but had to wait for release. Despite efforts to maintain interest and to provide for review and practice, the lapse of time allowed a withering of skills and an eroding of self-confidence of the trainees. Job development, placement and supportive planning also suffered. During the last months of training and after June 1965, fewer trainees were placed in jobs by RYT staff. Many were left to rely on their own resources, and on the resources available to the control group in finding jobs.

Despite these difficulties, and the fact that a large number of experimental subjects did not get a full array of transition services, some important findings have resulted. The data from the RYT study provide research evidence that:

> A program of vocational education and training in a jail, coupled with appropriate post-release services to manage re-entry into free society does make a difference in subsequent job performance and social adjustment of young offenders.
>
> Contrary to traditional expectations, and though the jail is a short-term institution with consequently brief periods of inmate availability for training, enough time is available to initiate a

sequence of activity which can have significant rehabilitative impact. A constructive program can be established to wisely use the time inmates spend in jail.

1. The rate of return to jail can be reduced. Only 48% of the experimentals committed crimes which brought them back to jail or prison as compared to 66% of the controls who returned to jail or prison.
2. Even those legal offenders who are most likely to continue a life of crime were helped. Only 55% of the drug addicts in the experimental group returned to jail. Eighty percent of the drug addicts in the control group returned to jail.
3. New opportunities in the world of work were opened for the trainees. Seventy-one percent of the experimentals worked in companies using automated data-processing techniques as contrasted with 16% of the controls.
4. Social mobility was fostered for the young men receiving training and transitional services. Forty-eight percent of experimentals were in white-collar jobs. Only 18% of con-

trols found jobs in white-collar occupations.

5. Only 5% of experimentals worked in jobs where physical labor was a major requirement while 22% of the controls worked in such jobs.
6. The number of young men locked into dead-end jobs was reduced. Twenty-five percent of the jobs held by experimentals usually led to promotion. Only 3% of the jobs held by controls usually led to promotion.
7. Eighty-nine percent of the jobs held by experimentals provide on-the-job training which will develop new and additional skills. Only 69% of the jobs held by controls provide such on-the-job training.
8. A year later, 17% of experimentals are in the company where they were originally placed. Only 9% of controls are still with the same company.

Most of the observations and evaluations set forth in the following pages are based on the interviews, and questionnaires gathered and verified during the follow-up phase of the study. These data were collected under the direct supervision of the senior author and provide the most up-to-date material. They tend to be used as the major source. The test scores and personal data sheets compiled from the young men while they were still in jail were also used. Finally, the report also seeks to evaluate some of the technical problems, and operational management experiences that were encountered. RYT was an attempt to establish a controlled experimental design and "laboratory" in a type of ongoing service program where the basic philosophy and institutionalized purposes tend to resist research and change. Any large scale social science research undertaken in a service setting can expect to encounter difficulty in maintaining a rigorous and thoroughly scientific application of its research design and in the staffing and administration of such a project. Jail conditions, however, present some unusual problems and challenges. It is hoped that the experiences and observations shared here can provide useful guidelines for rehabilitation programs and future research in jail settings. Some difficulties can be identified and anticipated. Perhaps some pitfalls can be entirely avoided. More precise advance planning and programming can follow to assure greater success.

As is true with most ground-breaking experiments, however, the observations and findings that can be shared at this point are important, not so much because of any final truth they contain, but because they may help clarify the problem and provide an improved perspective for future work in the area.

CHAPTER II

THE JAIL AND THE WORLD OF WORK

The Correctional Institution for Men on Rikers Island

The jail on Rikers Island in New York City, where the training program of RYT was carried out, is the largest jail in the world. Situated in the middle of the busy East River, near a steady stream of commuters using the Triborough Bridge and just opposite the busy air traffic of La Guardia Airport, it is an isolated and withdrawn spot surrounded by millions of people and bustling activity. It shares the peculiarly lonely quality that everywhere seems to invest correctional institutions built on islands. It is as if nature and mankind have been aligned in a rejection of the offender and have joined forces to exile him and to doubly insulate themselves against him.

At first contact, because of its size and location, the jail complex on the island seems more like a long-term prison than a short-term, local jail. With subsequent contacts, it becomes increasingly clear that it is simply the largest, most impressive and most dramatic example of the jail in American society. Its functions, operations and concerns are duplicated in smaller editions all across the country. But because it is larger it has a potential for development of experimental research designs and experimental-control groups that would be difficult to obtain in more limited settings.

How Many Jails are There?

Surprisingly, we don't know how many jails there are in the United States. The most recent estimate by the National Jail Association suggests that there are probably 3,100 county jails, 10,000 city jails and lock-ups and and perhaps 100 workhouses and jail farms in the nation as a whole. In size, these various facilities range from small lock-ups, where one or two persons may be imprisoned, to such mammoth systems as the New York City jail system, where 10,000 inmates may be incarcerated at any one time, and more than 100,000 people may be held during a single year.

How Many People are in Jail?

No accurate comprehensive statistics exist to tell us exactly how many people spend part of their life in jail. However, the admittedly minimal estimates which can be compiled are staggering in their implications for society. It has been estimated that over two million people pass through the nation's jails every year. On any single day, approximately 100,000 persons are behind bars in America's jails. Moreover, this daily figure of 100,000 represents only a fraction of the population who are likely to be jailed sometime in their lives. Statistically, the odds are that approximately one out of every 100 persons met in the course of a day is likely to spend some part of his life in jail.

Even with inadequate ways of counting we do know that more people are imprisoned in the jails of our country than in all other correctional institutions combined. At the beginning of 1964, for example, there were only 217,280 sentenced prisoners confined in all state and federal prisons for adult felony offenders in the United States.[1] Further, eight out of every ten persons arrested for major crimes had been arrested previously for minor crimes. Finally, there is considerable evidence that a majority of people in jail are less than 30 years old. The average inmate is at an age when he might be expected to be part of the labor force and making a vigorous contribution, he is an unproductive drain on public resources. Unless a major effort is made to help the inmates break out of a criminal career and become self-sustaining, they and their families will continue to constitute an ever mounting drain on public welfare resources.

Public Attitudes Toward the Jail

To the average citizen, however, until it impinges on him in some direct way, a jail that he might pass every day is a place apart and is likely to be as unknown to him as some of the most distant and least explored parts of the world. Public reaction to jails is quite simple. They are perceived as unpleasant places and are avoided as much as possible.

---

[1] National Prisoners Statistics, "Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions," No. 36, December 1964.

It is true that jails are not pleasant places to know, but they are very important in our society and a great deal more should be known about them. It is easier, however, to point to the need, than to demonstrate effective ways of filling the gaps in our knowledge.

Anyone who has not experienced the stress of living in a jail will have difficulty in knowing what a jail is like "on the inside". The usual public relations kind of inspection tour does not provide this kind of experience. The casual visitor really sees only the physical plant and an outline of the daily schedule and routine. He sees a "typical" cell, he walks through the hospital, through workshops and the exercise yard. He may pause in the kitchen where his guide will call for a bowl and a spoon so that the visitor can taste the soup that is being prepared for the next meal. A loaf of newly baked bread may be sliced so that its fragrance, quality and texture can be admired. The visitor also views the carefully typed, mimeographed and posted menus planned for the day and the week ahead. Obviously the inmate gets better food and better physical care than many people outside. Any questions that are asked are freely answered. On the whole, modern jails are not secret places. Yet, when the tour is completed, if the visitor is thoughtful he is aware that he has seen very little that has added to his knowledge and understanding of what life is like in a jail.

Many people tend to confuse the concept of jail with ideas about imprisonment in general. In the public mind, jails are often mistakenly identified as local equivalents of state prisons. It is assumed that the basic programs and activities of jails and prisons are essentially the same. There are similarities, of course, and where policy and practice at the state prison is of poor quality and tied to tradition, differences may not be very obvious. However, in superior prison management there are important differences.

The most immediately apparent and obvious differences are associated with the length of incarceration and the ways in which time is used. Jails only incarcerate persons for relatively short periods of time.[2] This limitation has had a comprehensive, penetrating influence on the attitudes and expectations of those people responsible for the administration and operation of jail programs. Because of the short-term nature of jails it is often the case that no attempt is made to provide any program other than secure custody. Many people believe that there is insufficient time to undertake diagnosis, classification, training and/or treatment programs which are urged as necessities in long-term institutions. Even energetic and progressive professionals in the general field of Corrections are inclined to be pessimistic about the potential contribution of the short-term institution to rehabilitation and change of individual offenders. Where such beliefs prevail, programming tends to be reduced to matters of institutional maintenance, keeping prisoners occupied, and containing frustration and boredom within safe limits.

---

[2] Under the law in most states, local institutions may confine persons with sentences of only one year and less. There are, however, exceptions to this practice of limiting county institution sentences. Pennsylvania is a major exception to this rule. Adhering to its past, 13 of its local institutions confine prisoners with sentences up to and including life. In New York State, only New York County may confine persons with sentences of more than one year in its local institutions. A limitation of three years is substituted. In Massachusetts, sentences of up to 2 1/2 years may be served in the County House of Correction. In Ohio, some prisoners with long sentences are still confined in the Cincinnati workhouse. These are the major exceptions in the United States.

Real vocational training is a rarity in jails. Sometimes, working parties of inmates assigned to institutional maintenance and the hand labor on jail farms and in workhouses are described as offering a kind of vocational preparation or discipline for work. There are circumstances where such claims might be justified, but ordinarily it is arrant nonsense and irresponsible rationalization of inadequacy. For the most part, this use of jail inmates is likely to be merely a way of keeping the inmate population occupied and of housekeeping with a limited operating budget.

Education in jail also is limited. On occasion, part-time and evening classes are developed by volunteers from outside the institution and by inmates and jail personnel willing to do extra work. However, most of these programs offer limited vocational training and are handicapped by a meagre quality of materials and facilities.

RYT took exception to beliefs that the diagnostic potential and brief training possibilities available in jail could not have an important effect. The project was designed to develop and study a rehabilitative sequence and constructive way of using the time young offenders spend in jail. It also was an attempt to use the jail as a base for beginning transitional treatment activities that would lead to self-management in the free community.

The Adolescent Division at Rikers Island

One of the divisions of the sprawling institutional complex on Rikers Island is designated to house young men, 16-24 years of age. It seemed to the innovators of RYT that this population was a logical group to be involved in an experiment to test the value of training and transitional services.

Approximately 15,000 such young adults serve jail sentences in this unit every year. Most of these young men come from lower-class, disadvantaged and racial minority groups in the community. The largest percentage of them are school dropouts, having completed an average of only slightly more than nine years of formal education. Their life histories are characterized by repeated arrests, convictions, incarcerations and intermittent employment in marginal jobs. They come from neighborhoods where they are frequently

39

exposed to attitudes, expectations and social definitions that are relatively favorable to law violation and supportive of crime as part of their pattern of living. (See Tables 2-19)

Problems of Young Adults in Jail

The problems of young people in jail which lead to their incarceration are essentially the same as the basic problems facing most young adults in a complex, industrialized society. The troublesome, illegal behavior they exhibit is learned in response to these problems in much the same manner as any behavior is learned.

One of the central problems that they share with other young people is that of entering a modern world of work. Technological advances, improved production techniques, and sweeping changes in the occupational structure have resulted in a steady decline of jobs for unskilled and inexperienced young workers. The world of work seems to be particularly forbidding when viewed from the perspective of the youngster who ends up as a jail inmate.

In 1965, for example, the United States Department of Labor estimated that one out of every eight teenagers looking for work could not find a job. There is also evidence that long-term unemployment is disproportionately high and on the increase among young workers. Thus, in the period 1957 to 1962 the rate of long-term unemployment increased about 50% for the labor force as a whole. Among twenty to twenty-four year olds, however, unemployment increased 70% during the same period. By 1962 nearly 25 out of every 100 jobless persons in this age group had been seeking work fifteen weeks or longer.[3] The implication for a young man with a criminal history is obvious. If the labor market is difficult for an ordinary young person without a jail record it is proportionately more difficult and limited for a young man with a jail record. He has multiple handicaps and barriers to overcome. In addition to any ordinary handicaps of inexperience and lack of preparation which may be shared with youth in general, he is also likely to be struggling with problems of minority group status, cultural deprivation and educational deficit. Finally, he is marked as he emerges from jail by his criminal history and jail record. Employers do not regard an ex-offender as an attractive potential employee. Other factors being equal, the man with a criminal history and jail record is least likely to be hired for worthwhile, responsible jobs.

The future seems even more bleak and discouraging. "From 1965 to 1970 the total labor force is expected to rise by over 1 1/2 million a year, an average annual increase nearly 50% greater than the first half of the 1960's and almost double that of the 1950's. By 1970, the labor force is expected to total 86 million persons, almost a fifth more than in 1960."[4]

---

[3] Manpower Research Bulletin No. 1, July 1963, "Mobility and Worker Adaptation to Economic Change in the United States", pg. 9. See also Table 1 on pg. 8 of this same bulletin.

Along with this tremendous expansion it is expected that the labor force will be proportionately younger. Nearly half of the new job seekers expected in the next five years will be under age twenty-five. The Department of Labor has stated: "The pressures to develop appropriate jobs and to match workers with existing job openings will be particularly critical in view of the large number of workers under age twenty-five who will be continuing to enter the labor force...over all, the total number of teenage and young adult workers (aged 14 to 24) is expected to increase by almost seven hundred thousand a year, constituting about 45% of the increase in the labor force between now and 1970.

"The problem becomes especially acute because the sharpest labor force growth will be among workers in their early twenties. Almost two thirds will be young men looking mainly for full time jobs and facing the income needs that come with marriage and family formation. From 1965 to 1970, the number of persons 20 to 24 years old in the job market will be increasing by close to 500,000 or 4.8% per year - 2 1/2 times the rate for the labor force as a whole. By 1970 there may be close to 12 million of these young workers representing about 14% of the total labor force compared with 12% currently and 10% in 1960."[5]

---

[4] Manpower Report of the President 1966, pg. 37.

Drastic changes also are taking place in the occupational structure of the nation. Most of the jobs of the future will require workers with higher levels of skill and better education than in the past. The need for unskilled workers to do the repetitive kinds of tasks previously required in mass production is diminishing rapidly. Fewer people are required to produce greater amounts of goods.

Even "primary" industries such as agriculture, lumbering and mining have reduced the gross numbers of people needed to extract and deliver raw materials. Traditionally, these industries have offered the largest proportion of heavy labor, low skilled, manual jobs. Similar technological advances in manufacturing have reduced the demand for unskilled labor to convert raw materials into finished products.

Throughout industry and business a marked shift has taken place: away from handwork to "brain-work" and away from direct physical participation in production to intermediate activities. As the number of automated systems and operations proliferate, increasing numbers of technicians are needed with special competence to build, install, maintain and program the new machines. Supervision, quality control and accounting create new demands for white-collar workers and interpersonal skills in management and human services. Proportionately, decreasing numbers of employees are working with materials and increasing numbers are working with systems, symbols and people. As a result, the modern world of work in the United States cannot absorb a great number of young people who are not educated to work with symbols, systems and people; who cannot read, write and add.

---

[5] Ibid. pg. 38.

41

As might be expected, the educational attainment of workers in the labor force has been rising steadily. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, during the period 1940-1959, the median years of school completed by the labor force as a whole lengthened from 9 to 12 years. Further, the percentage of workers graduating from high school rose from 32 percent in 1940 to 51 percent in 1959. Nearly 10 percent of all workers had graduated from college in 1959 as compared with only 5.7 percent in 1940. There are several indications that this trend will continue. Thus, the Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts that 70 percent of young workers entering the labor market in the 1960's will have a high school education or better.

It is estimated that more than 1.8 million jobs will be affected every year of the next decade as a result of automation and similar related advances. Although some skilled workers will be affected by these changes, the heaviest impact will be carried by those in our society who are least able to sustain such a loss, (i.e.), by those who are under-educated or who have limited experience and skills and by those who are handicapped physically or socially (e.g., minority group members). Certainly the situation of the young adult leaving jail is bound to become more stressful. Already he is at the bottom of the occupational ladder, competing for a rapidly diminishing supply of unskilled and routine jobs. With increasing emphasis on education and social competence the jobs that are available become dead-ends rather than entry-level jobs which might be used as stepping stones to more productive positions later. The seriousness of his plight can be seen by the following comparison of educational attainments of young adults in jail with education reported for the labor force as a whole.

Demographic information was collected on a large random sample (1008) of young men sentenced to the New York City jail in 1963-64. (See Table 1) Of this group, more than 93 percent were early school leavers. Nearly 62 percent of the total group had completed some high school work, but only 6.6 percent actually graduated from high school. Approximately 31 percent had dropped out before reaching the tenth grade. Three young men had gone to college. Only one of these had completed four years. Three young men had no formal education at all.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that 7 out of 10 young workers entering the labor market in the 1960's will have a high-school education or better. At Rikers Island less than 1 out of 10 were found to have a high-school education or better.

TABLE 1

Educational Attainments of a Random Sample of Males
Age 16-25 - Committed to New York City Jail
in 1963-64

Highest Grade Attained	Number	Percentage of Total
No Schooling	3	.3
Some Grade School	84	8.3
Grade School Graduate	34	3.4
Some Jr. High School	125	12.4
Junior High School Graduate	65	6.4
Some H.S. (10th or 11th)	623	61.8
H.S. Graduate	67	6.6
Some College	2	.2
College Graduate	1	.1
Information not Available	4	.4
TOTAL	1008	

Actually, using the highest grade level achieved may result in an overestimation of the ability of young adults in jail to perform basic tasks requiring reading and comprehension of abstract concepts. Thus, for example, even with greatly lowered scoring standards, 40 percent of the young adult population at Rikers Island were unable to score well enough on the IBM Punched Card Machine Operator Aptitude Test and the Beta Test of Intelligence so that they could be considered for training. This finding is consistent with the findings reported by many studies comparing delinquents and non-delinquents. Such studies repeatedly have shown that despite essential similarities in intelligence, the reading skills and verbal conceptual abilities of delinquents are far below those of non-delinquents.[6] Without some more effective mode of intervention, the employment prospects for young men with these deficiencies and background are shockingly grim.

---

[6] Many references appear in the literature. The following are selected because they bear most directly on the problem:

Farragher, Mary, "The Antisocial Child and the School." The School Review 72: 472-89, Winter 1964.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor, Delinquents in the Making New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. p. 70.

Havighurst, Robert J. "Poor Reading and Delinquency May Go Hand in Hand" The Nation's Schools, Vol. 64, No. 5, Nov. 1959, pp. 55-58.

Lichter, Solomon O., Papien, Elsie B., Seibert, Frances N., Sklansky, Morris A., The Dropouts Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1962. p. 2.

Travers, John G., "Educational Problems of Delinquency." Catholic School Journal 64: 28-29, January 1964. p. 28.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz' statement to the Congressional Sub-Committee on Unemployed states the problem precisely:

> "The blunt fact is that a man who cannot read and write is simply not prepared to survive in our technology-dominated economy -- there is no future for the unschooled, unskilled worker."

Educational Opportunities for Young Offenders

In one important respect the Adolescent Division on Rikers Island differs from the other divisions in the jail and from jails elsewhere. The New York City Board of Education has established a public school there. However, everyone is not eligible to attend the school, and less than 5% of the young prisoners were enrolled at the time of the RYT study. Some inmates not assigned to school may be assigned to laundry, bakery, kitchen and maintenance work crews. Wherever possible, institutional staff try to provide incidental vocational training as part of this production assignment, but there are obvious limitations to what can be given under such conditions and there is not enough work for everyone. Thus, while they are in jail the majority of inmates receive no training that will help them vocationally and they have only limited access to basic education.

There are fewer opportunities for education when they are released. Even if they were motivated to do so, most of these young men cannot return to school during the day. Moreover, because of previously poor educational achievement, criminal history and lack of marketable job skills, they cannot find steady work. Consequently they are ineligible for vocational training in the evening schools of the City, since a pre-requisite for enrollment in these programs is gainful full-time employment.

The Psychological Impact of Imprisonment

In addition to various handicaps the young offender may carry with him as he enters the jail and the obvious handicap imposed by the label of "jail-bird" that is attached as he leaves, the experience of living in a jail can be damaging in itself.

A concern is often expressed that confining criminals together allows them to exchange ideas and information that will enable them to become more efficient as lawbreakers and to escape detection. This is a possible risk, but as a factor contributing to recidivism it seems to be less significant than the subtle depersonalization and erosion of individuality that emerges as an unintended by-product in the process of institutionalization. Several patterns of adaptation and adjustment to this stress have been reported in the criminological literature. Cloward, for example, has suggested that the system of social control used by correctional institutions may generate the very behavior it is supposed to avert. The acute sense of status degradation experienced by prisoners creates powerful pressures to develop mechanisms by which individual worth and dignity can be defended or restored.

A principal mechanism of this sort is that of the inmate culture; a system of social relationships within the institution, governed by norms which move in a direction opposite to those espoused by the officials and conventional society. The inmate social system provides a way of life which enables the inmate to avoid the devastating psychological effects of accepting, internalizing and converting social rejection into self-rejection.[7] It enables him to reject his rejectors.[8]

Unfortunately, society is caught in a conflict between methods of handling offenders and incidental effects of these methods. Often there seems to be no logical alternative to imprisonment. At the same time, there is considerable evidence that holding people in jail or prison tends to damage them in ways which create further problems. In the process of being disciplined so they can live in the free community, offenders often are made less capable of actually living in the free community.[9]

A Summary Statement

The average young offender entering the labor market after serving a sentence in jail faces greater employment problems than does the average young worker.

---

[7] "Social Control in the Prison" Cloward, Richard A. Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison Social Science Research Council Pamphlet, No. 15, March 1960 pp. 20-48.

[8] Mc Corkle, Lloyd W., Korn, Richard R., "Resocialization within Walls" Annuals of the Amer. Academy of Police & Social Science, Vol. 293, May 1954.

[9] Clemmer, D., The Prison Community, Christopher Publishing, Boston, 1940.

On the whole, they are more poorly educated than the general population; a majority having left school at an early age. Before coming to jail and after their return to the community they are likely to live in marginal, impoverished, culturally deprived sections of the community. Their employment record is sporadic; a sequence of short-term jobs interspersed with frequent periods of unemployment. When they are working, the jobs they occupy are likely to be low-skilled and low-pay. Few of them are equipped to compete successfully in today's job market. The jobs for which they do qualify are decreasing in numbers because of technological advances and changes in the occupational structure. Not only is the number of jobs decreasing, but because more young workers are entering the labor market the competition is tougher. In addition, educational and training requirements for good jobs are getting higher.

Young adults entering the labor market from jail are likely to be excluded from a choice of good jobs because they are non-white, poorly educated, culturally impoverished and different, and because they have criminal histories and jail records. For the most part, the young offender is quite alone in his search for work. His family and friends may be interested, but they are not likely to be a very helpful resource. Ordinarily they are struggling with many of the same handicaps besetting him.

Most people would agree that it is highly important for an ex-offender to have a good job. Most people would have sympathy for the problems he faces and would be inclined to agree that he should have a chance to prove himself. But in the vast majority of cases there is no one willing to take the risk, and no agency with power and specific responsibility to provide such an opportunity. Private social agencies are reluctant to deal with this difficult population. They have long waiting lists and priorities for service are generally given to applicants who do not have a prison or jail history. Public social agencies are only slightly more accessible. Responsibility for helping socially handicapped people is so divided among several public agencies that it is easy to overlook the fact that no one has responsibility for handling the continuing deleterious effects of incarceration. Parole, where it exists, is oriented toward surveillance and community protection, not toward service for the parolee. The Welfare Department deals with welfare needs... Public Health with health needs...the Employment Service may refer for jobs...but none of these agencies have power to help the released offender with the unique handicap he continues to carry. Supposedly the released offender has paid for his crime. It is implied that punishment is complete when the offender has "paid" with a certain number of days and nights of his life and that he may be restored to society with a "clean slate". Legally this may be reasonably true... but in the reality of social relationships it is false.

Release from jail is just a matter of "letting go"; nothing more. It is more appropriate to describe most release procedures from jail as legal reinsertions rather than restorations to society. For the majority of people sentenced to jail, public responsibility is deemed to be ended when their sentence has been served to completion. The barred doors of the jail are opened and the erstwhile prisoner is ejected, albeit with willingness on his part, into the community. At Rikers Island, for example, it has been the practice to give the man a bologna sandwich and 25¢ as he is being released so that he has "something" to eat and can make one telephone call and buy one subway token. This assumes an acceptance from society and a relationship with others in the community that often does not square with the facts. Many jails do not make even this kind of limited provision.

CHAPTER III

THE RYT EXPERIMENT

Basically, RYT was an experiment designed to test the proposition that recidivism could be reduced by (1) raising employability levels of young offenders leaving jail, (2) placing them in good quality work situations where existing labor market shortages and future growth potential lowered the risk of unemployment, and (3) providing them with access to supportive services in the community that would help them stay at work.

RYT believed that levels of employability, quality of work, and opportunity for advancement at work are important determinants of status, personality and social role; including such social roles as "delinquent" and "criminal". In addition, RYT believed that the tendency of many young offenders to revert to criminal patterns of living after release from jail may be associated with factors of work and occupation that operate to restrict certain groups and individuals to extremely low levels of employment.

Theoretical Bases for Assuming a Relationship Between Crime and Problems of Employment:

In recent years, evidence of a positive relationship between adult crime and unemployment has accumulated.[1,2] Data gathered by Glaser in his careful and comprehensive study of the federal prison and parole systems suggests that "... unemployment may be among the principal causal factors involved in recidivism of adult male offenders".[3] This observation by Glaser has recently been supported and documented further by Pownall and Wellford[4] in a preliminary report of an as yet uncompleted study supported by the United States Department of Labor, which focused specifically upon the employment problems of released offenders. As these various authors point out, such correlations should not be interpreted to imply a simple, direct causality between criminal behavior and inadequate vocational adjustment and unemployment. The majority of unemployed persons do not become delinquent. Nevertheless, there is evidence that the two patterns may have common roots. Where criminal behavior and poor vocational adjustment appear together in a single person, they may be related symptoms, reflecting an

---

[1] Glaser, D. & Rice, K., "Crime, Age and Unemployment", American Sociological Review, 24: Oct. 1959, pg. 679-686.

[2] Fleisher, B., "The Effect of Unemployment on Delinquent Behavior", Journal of Political Economics, 71: 1963, pg.543-555.

[3] Glaser, D., The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System, Bobbs-Merrill Co., N. Y., 1964, pp. 329

[4] Pownall, G. A., & Wellford, C., "Employment Problems of Released Prisoners: A Preliminary Survey and Analysis of Released Federal Prisoners under the Supervision of the U. S. Federal Probation Office", Paper delivered at National Congress of American Correctional Association in May, 1966.

underlying condition (social-economic-personal) that requires help. Such correlations lead to the plausible presumption that if one works on problems that cause the individual to be a poor employee, one may be working on problems relating to delinquency as well.

Frequently, the delinquent and criminal population have been labeled as unemployable. Strictly speaking, it would be imprecise to term these young men "unemployable" since numbers of short-term, low-paying, mediocre jobs are available to them. To the extent that they can find a job - no matter how marginal - they are not truly unemployable. The point is that many of these available jobs are dead-ends. The real issues of employability for ex-inmates of jails and prisons are sometimes lost or glossed over by casual assumptions that willing men can always find work and that most low-paying jobs can be used as stepping stones to better jobs. Some low-paying jobs are entries to better work, others lead nowhere. The two possibilities should not be confused.

By defining the issues and goals of RYT in terms of raising the level of employability, RYT was undertaking to break a traditional pattern of operation which tends to push young offenders into low-level jobs and to maintain them there. A widespread defeatist philosophy tends to color the community's approach to job placement and social mobility for these young people. This is illustrated by the prevailing practice of employment counselors who emphasize the obstacles to placement and tend to advise young offender clients to aim for objectives which admittedly are below their potential, but which are called "realistic" because openings are available. Unfortunately, some aspects of current parole practice also tend to reinforce such attitudes. Parole rules often require offenders to have jobs before they can be considered for release on parole. Not many good jobs can be negotiated from inside the jail. Further, parole rules make it clear, that steady work habits will be taken as evidence of reformation and periods of unemployment will be questioned. Whenever rules such as these are applied rigidly there is a tendency for both parolee and parole officer to be preoccupied with superficial evidence that the parolee has been working every day rather than with quality and future potential of employment. Often there seems to be no leeway for exploration and development such as would be expected and allowed for an ordinary youth. As a result, young parolees frequently wind up in the jobs that are easiest to find; jobs as delivery boys, messengers, dishwashers, counter boys, bus boys, etc.

Youth entering the world of work generally start with inherently less stable and less satisfying jobs. They lack experience and seniority. With seasonal or economic fluctuations they are the first to be laid-off. In the beginning of their working careers they are uncertain about where they want to work and what kind of work they want to do. Searching and shifting from job to job is usual, and periods of joblessness are almost inevitable if they are motivated to improve their status. However, despite the fact that such problems of transition are not unique to persons coming from jail, society seems less accepting of the ex-inmate in this regard and less inclined to grant him this flexibility. Therefore, the young ex-inmate not only starts with dead-end jobs, but since he does not have the freedom, security, information or perspective to press for other options, he tends to stay at the same level. If he is willing, it is possible for him to be almost continuously employed in a series of menial jobs.

Such "steadiness" can be misleading in its apparent promise for reducing recidivism. Under certain circumstances, for example, it may only mask a slow, insidious progression toward further delinquency. It may postpone, but not really prevent. While a small, steady income undoubtedly eases some pressures, and regular attendance at work would probably reduce the amount of free time in which delinquency might occur, there is evidence that these factors, by themselves, do not offset the influence of other, more potent factors. Sutherland and Cressey, for example, have argued that low prestige, low pay and temporary, short-term jobs tend to root disadvantaged youth in a milieu where they are exposed to excessive criminogenic stresses.[5] Further, steady employment in a marginal occupation tends to be identifying and confirming of marginality. Over an extended period of time such identification and confirmation may destroy capacities necessary for the development of effective self-management. Although social class and sub-cultural values introduce some variations, effective self-management as an adult, without intervention from social agencies, is dependent, in large part, upon the success that the adult has in getting enough money to meet his needs, to pay his bills and to care for those who are dependent upon him. Thus, an unemployed recipient of welfare funds is apt to be less in control of his life as a result of his way of getting money. Many aspects of his life now come under scrutiny, evaluation and planning by others. Where, and how he and his family lives, what the money should be spent for, whether he should be allowed to have more children, etc., all become matters of public concern and subject to varying degrees of public control.

---

[5] Sutherland, E. & Cressey, D., Principles of Criminology, Lippincott Co., Chicago, 1955, pp 194-195

Similar conditions operate in the life of the criminal. Different frames of reference exist for the apprehended offender and the undetected offender. The person who is caught and convicted is legally and socially assigned a different status. People and the community expect that he will behave differently. Because such social expectations are psychologically powerful influences and are expressed broadly and concretely both in social structure and daily experiences, the apprehended offender does behave differently. Paradoxically, criminals and delinquents are the products of the social systems and institutions used to identify and correct them. As a result of the peculiar assignment of law-enforcement, judicial procedures and correctional agencies while they control criminals they also manufacture them.

Garfinkel[6] has used the terms "status degradation" and "status degradation ceremonies" to identify and define the social process and public communication activities that go on when a group moves to transform the social identity of one of its members into an identity lower in the scheme of social types used by the group. A degradation ceremony is the public denunciation and ritual destruction of the identity of a person who has aroused feelings of moral indignation in the community. In this transformation, the prime concern is not with what a person has done or may do, but rather with what the group holds to be the ultimate "grounds" or "reasons" for such behavior. The public expression of moral indignation not only serves to provide a basis for rejection and control of the person denounced, but also may reinforce group solidarity.

Two aspects of the ceremonies are crucial: First - "... the transformation of identities is the destruction of one social object and the constitution of another. The transformation does not involve the substitution of one identity for another, with the terms of the old one loitering about like the overlooked parts of a fresh assembly, ... It is not that that the old object has been overhauled; rather it is replaced by another. One declares, "Now, it was otherwise in the first place."

---

[6] Garfinkel, Harold "Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 61, March 1956 pp 420-424

"The work of denunciation effects the recasting of the objective character of the perceived other: the other person becomes in the eyes of his condemners literally a different and new person. It is not that the new attributes are added to the old "nucleus." He is not changed, he is reconstituted. The former identity, at best, receives the accent of mere appearance. In the social calculus of reality representations and test, the former identity stands as accidental; the new identity is the "basic reality." What he is now is what, "after all", he was all along."[7]

Second, the new identity assigned to the individual is of a lower order in the social scheme. It is as if all men now have been called upon to "...bear witness that he is not as he appears but is otherwise and in essence of a lower species".[8] Thus, the young offenders in jail are likely to be perceived by prospective employers as persons who have been "unmasked" and revealed as of essentially baser quality than others of similar ability. Regardless of aptitude and training the person carrying the stigma of having served time is regarded unfavorably. No more pertinent example could be developed than the experience reported by one of the follow-up interviewers in the RYT project. She had been interviewing a supervisor in a company that had hired one of the boys from the experimental group. The supervisor had been describing the boy's work performance in glowing terms. Suddenly it became apparent that this particular supervisor had not known about the delinquent history of this trainee. The boy had been hired and placed by a personnel manager who had since left the company. "Before my very eyes," said the interviewer, "I could see the attitude of the supervisor changing. And in spite of everything I could do he insisted on examining the boy's performance from an entirely new perspective." The speed and inflexibility of such transformations can be disturbing. Almost before there is awareness, people begin to deal with an accused person as a different personality, and since the individual often has much of society in himself an answering echo of shame and guilt may be "heard" inside and he himself unconsciously begins to respond to their revised expectations.

---

[7] Ibid. pp. 421

[8] Ibid. pp. 421

Many less dramatic illustrations than the one noted above can be observed in every day life. William I. Thomas makes a cogent observation as to why this is so: "It is also highly important for us to realize that we do not as a matter of fact lead our lives, make our decisions, and reach our goals in every day life either statistically or scientifically. We live by inference. I am, let us say, your guest. You do not know, you can not determine scientifically, that I will not steal your money or your spoons, but inferentially I will not

62

and inferentially you have me as a guest."[9] In commenting about this same kind of inter-action, Goffman observes that "...when the individual is in the immediate presence of others his activity will have a promissory character. The others are likely to find that they must accept the individual on faith, offering him a just return while he is present before them in exchange for something whose true value will not be established until after he has left their presence. ...The security that they justifiably feel in making inferences about the individual will vary, of course, depending on such factors as the amount of information they already possess about him, but no amount of such past evidence can entirely obviate the necessity of acting on the basis of inferences."[10] Thus, largely on the basis of such an inferential process and the social inertia which is involved, society tends to deal with unidentified offenders as if they were not delinquent and tends to act as if crime and delinquency were alien behaviors imposed on an otherwise innocent and law abiding community. As a result, although an individual's characteristic frame of reference and behavior may be larcenous and predatory, neither for himself nor for the world at large does he assume the social role of criminal or *delinquent* until he is convicted in court and committed to some function of the correctional system.

---

[9] Quoted in Volkart, E.H., editor, Social Behavior & Personality, Contributions of W.I. Thomas to Theory & Social Research, Social Science Research Council New York, 1951, pp. 5.

[10] Goffman, Erving, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life Doubleday Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company, New York 1959, pp.2-3

Self-Management and Occupational Role:

The degree of control that a person is able to maintain over his own life and his effectiveness in avoiding the type of social interaction that leads to identification as a criminal are conditioned by the quality and effectiveness of occupational roles and experience available to the individual.

Perception of the world of work can be expanded or contracted by different experiences. Relevant experience may come in direct, personal participation as a worker, and also can be derived from observer-participant experience (e.g.) with a family, friends or neighborhood. However, the quality of experience can vary. Ghetto living prevents people from seeking certain jobs and restricts mobility. It also limits the perception of present and future opportunities. For example, as a Negro youth sees and experiences discrimination, his belief in his own capacity to shape his life through work and education can be undermined. Similarly as the adolescent with a criminal history finds himself shunted into a series of low paying, low prestige jobs he may well develop feelings of inadequacy and may yield to the many adolescent pressures to immediate short term goals and pleasures.

Other patterns of response also may be developed. Cloward and Ohlin[11], in their theoretical analysis of gang delinquency have taken the position that criminal behavior is an alternative chosen by young people when they are unable to find legitimate ways of satisfying their desire for money and the things that money can buy. Youth from disadvantaged sectors of society are particularly likely to become alienated as they discover that ethnic and class barriers prevent them from attaining a fair share of the good things in life. As an antidote, these authors contend that improved work opportunities will reduce the tendency to solve these psycho-social stresses by deviant means. In particular, they suggest that this will be effective with urban youth from socially and economically deprived groups.

---

[11] Cloward, R. & Ohlin, L., *Delinquency & Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs*, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1960.

Albert Cohen[12] similarly takes a position that status frustration rather than economic frustration is the major stimulus to gang formation. The delinquent gang is explained as a means of gaining respect of others.

Both of these theoretical positions had important implications for planning RYT. If a training and placement program were to be maximally effective, it would have to be designed to meet the youthful hunger for recognition and should deliberately provide opportunities for achieving interpersonal success as well as providing improved economic opportunities. Subsequent experience in RYT demonstrated the critical importance of such a strategy. Despite careful early anticipation and planning, the intensity and depth of these needs was under estimated. There must be some sort of sustaining social structure and programming to carry the trainee through the ego-destructive experiences of training and the stress generated by placement in a new status level of work.

---

[12] Cohen, A., Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1955.

In American society, becoming a man socially as well as physically may be associated with work and attitudes toward work.[13] However, when satisfactory occupational alternatives are not available, young people will seek other means of establishing personal identity. If available patterns of work or the adolescent's perception of the world of work do not lead toward a satisfying image of the adult male role, the adolescent is likely to reject work and occupy himself with other patterns.[14] Depending on the social structure in which this rejection occurs and the alternative patterns and definitions that are available, some of these new patterns of identification may lead to crime and delinquency.

The style and content of these patterns is influenced by sub-cultural factors as well as by larger societal conditions. For example, a number of social scientists have suggested that the status of the average Negro male in American society is such that he tends to compensate for his failure to get a good job by a heavy emphasis on external evidences and symbols of individuality and masculinity. In his analysis of unemployment and identity, Jacobs tells about talking with a 19-year old Negro youth who was wearing an earring and a conspicuous 'kewpie' hair style. The young man was discussing his failure to get a job as a gas station attendant:

---

[13] Bloch, H. & Niederhoffer, A., The Gang: A Study in Adolescent Behavior, Philosophical Library, N. Y., 1958

[14] Havighurst, R. & Taba, H., Adolescent Character and Personality, John Wiley & Sons, N.Y., 1949

> "...when I asked him if he thought he hadn't gotten it because he was a Negro, he shook his head.
>
> "'No', he answered, 'I think I didn't get it because of the earring'.
>
> 'Well, why don't you get rid of the earring?', I asked.
>
> 'Because that earring is me, man, that shows who I am'."[15]

Jacobs raises the question as to what the outcome might be if this young man were to discard his earring, cut off his 'kewpie', and were to pattern himself after a white, middle-class youth. He suggests that although the boy might then be acceptable in appearance, he would not gain much in employability. It is still most likely that he will be eligible only for menial jobs. In the meantime he will have given up elements important to him in establishing his identity.

> "Then he might look like a young man referred to in a recent report of an upgrading project for Negro youth... One of the project's successes was described as a '...quiet,

---

[15] Jacobs, P., "A View from the Other Side: Unemployment as a Part of Identity", Unemployment in a Prosperous Economy, A report of the Princeton Manpower Symposium. Bowen, W. G. & Harbison, F. H. (Editors), Woodrow Wilson School of Public & International Affairs, Princeton, New Jersey, 1965 pp. 45-63.

> well-dressed young man. He was placed on a temporary and then a permanent bus boy job'. Or perhaps he might assume the appearance of another young man helped by the same project... 'A sharp, neat young man with two years of junior college. He was placed easily on two temporary jobs and then on a permanent warehouseman job'.
>
> But the kid with the earring believes such an exchange to be an unequal one".[16]

The pattern of adjustment and rejection of conformity described by Jacobs does not necessarily lead to delinquency or to adult crime. However, some of these young people almost casually move into petty crime and thereafter, into more serious crime. In a "street-corner sub-culture", loitering, fighting and petty theft occur with a nearly amoral naivete.[17] As these offenses are handled by arrests and punished by repeated short jail sentences when they appear in court, rather than by programs designed to attack underlying causative factors, the stage is set for the future return of these youngsters as serious criminals.

Implications for Design and Focus of RYT

In the preceding pages a number of correlates of crime and delinquency have been noted and briefly discussed. Obviously, many of the philosophies and procedures of social, educational, and economic institutions in American society need to be overhauled to provide a better basis for *preventing* crime and delinquency. This is a large-scale, long-range undertaking. In the meantime, there is a need for smaller, middle-range programs to deal effectively with the current state of affairs, to compensate for already existing, prior deprivation and to reduce present handicaps faced by disadvantaged sectors of society. This is the level at which RYT was focused.

---

[16] Ibid. p. 52

[17] Sellin, Thorsten, Culture Conflict and Crime (New York: Social Science Research Council, Bull. 41, 1938), pp. 23,24 Miller, Walter B., "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," Journal of Social Issues, XIV (No. 3, 1958), 5-19; William C. Kvaraceus and Walter B. Miller, Delinquent Behavior: Culture and the Individual (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association of the United States, 1959), especially Chapter 9.

Raising employability levels for young men entering the labor market after serving time in jail is essentially a problem of stimulating and managing an upward social mobility. In conceptualizing the RYT project goals in these terms, it should be recognized that the intention was not to transmit a broad range of middle-class values to lower-class and working-class youth. Rather, the major goal was to provide a new social role in work, together with enough support, and a sufficiently detailed script for performing the new social role in the work setting so that the individual might be able to adapt successfully. At the operational level, the prime objective was to provide a coordinated program of compensatory training, education and access to work opportunities which usually have been denied this group. Finally, a basic element in the program concept was that these youth need more than a single, isolated block of service; they need a continuity of service that begins in the jail and extends beyond their first job in the community. In order to provide such continuity, four major clusters of activity had to be planned and coordinated:

1. Deficiencies and negative attitudes inherent in the young men themselves would have to be modified to make them attractive to employers and to help them adapt to reasonable demands in the world of work.

2. Improved access to social service resources and better working relationships between social agencies in the community would have to be developed. It was assumed that most of the needed resources already were in existence. What was needed was timely access and capacity for follow-up. Of particular concern were the breakdowns in communication and referral between agencies.

3. Access to good-quality, entry-level jobs would have to be developed. Actual placement in work situations with a low risk of unemployment and with a future potential for advancement would be required.

4. An effective base of public understanding and community support would have to be developed.

Implications for the type of training to be given:

Certain implications with regard to the appropriate nature of the training which might be offered to this population have been suggested in the previous discussion. They are recapitulated here:

1. The training area selected must have the power to meet and satisfy economic, status and ego needs of the young men in the jailed population.

2. Training should be provided for an occupation in which critical labor market shortages existed so that trainees would be valuable to employers.

3. The entry-level qualifications for the occupational training selected should not be greater than could be provided in the time and facilities available in jail.

4. The training area selected must lead to a field of work with a viable future.

Training in a dead-end occupation would run the risk of stimulating hope and desire and then creating a backlash from disappointment when a promised or anticipated payoff did not materialize. In one sense this would be a brief enactment of the Cloward-Ohlin closed opportunity-structure recipe for delinquency. Training in a low-prestige occupation would be self-defeating. As an illustration of the problem to be avoided, the experiences reported in a Manpower Development Program in Newark, N. J., are pertinent. They had difficulty obtaining applicants for a program to train hospital attendants. Though unemployed, youngsters were not interested in a difficult job paying only $40.00 to $50.00 a week. They also offered a course to train waiters, an occupation in which there was a demand for workers. Again, there were relatively few takers; Negro youngsters understandably showed little interest. For them, the occupation of waiter was too close to the image of servility from which they were trying to escape.[18] Such considerations led to the selection of Electronic Data Processing (EDP) as a highly appropriate area of activity. Very likely, EDP would be perceived by the young adults in jail as a reasonably prestigeful kind of work. Further, it might have both dramatic and practical value as a vehicle to change the work orientation and perspective of the young men making up the study sample. Even though the training would be aimed at developing entry-level skills, the opportunities for the future could be specified and were not make-believe.

---

[18] Charles E. Silberman "Let's Talk About the Real World", American Child, Vol. 46, No. 4, November 1964

At the time when the project was started, a large number of vacancies existed for operators of the machines on which RYT youth could be given training. In July 1963 alone, the United States Civil Service announced examinations for over 200 jobs for operators on the machines used in the RYT program with entrance salaries ranging from $3,420 to $4,565 per annum. These jobs required only a performance test and no other academic certification; an important factor in view of the large number of school "dropouts" in the young offender population. In addition, it appeared that training for these jobs offered success in placement and stability of employment. The Bureau of Labor Statistics and the IBM Corporation estimated that job openings requiring data-processing skills would develop at a high demand rate over at least five years. Finally, prospective employers who had been canvassed by the Department of Correction Research and Planning staff indicated a willingness to cooperate and to interview trained youth, and to seriously consider hiring them.

Summary and Restatement in Research Terms

The personality structure of modern urban youth can be viewed as a complex mosaic of personal and interpersonal experiences and may be related to a variety of social roles, self perceptions, reference groups and social settings.

Ordinarily, new experiences are integrated into the prevailing frame of reference so as to require the least amount of personal-social reorganization. However, new experiences can stimulate dramatic shifts in perception of roles, and in the priorities and expectations that are attached to various roles and alternatives for response.

Thus it was hypothesized that significant changes could be stimulated in young offenders in jail by involving them in training for prestigeful occupation, accompanied by supportive guidance and counseling, and by skillful placement and provision of transitional supports and services in the community. It was believed that this continuum of services might create such a network of stress, help, and satisfaction around the new occupational role that deviant patterns of response might be interrupted and replaced by new social roles, new awareness and new alternatives for action. Over a period of time, it was hoped that new reference groups might be developed, and with increasing success experience, a better base for long-term commitment to non-delinquent patterns of living might be established.

By means of a control-group experimental design, RYT proposed to test the degree to which the employability of young adult inmates in jail could be increased and planned to seek answers to the following specific questions:

(a) Can young inmates in a short-term correctional institution be trained for jobs as data processing machine operators and successfully placed in such jobs at prevailing wage levels?

7

(b) How successful can such a program be in terms of the number of inmates that can be placed on jobs?

(c) How successful can such a program be in terms of successful work adjustment as measured by: attendance record, employer ratings and job satisfaction?

(d) Can a jail-based program of vocational training coupled with literacy training, ancillary services and job placement make a statistically significant reduction in recidivism when compared with a matched control group of inmates?

CHAPTER IV

MAKING THE PROJECT OPERATIONAL

Research Design

This study was designed on the classic experimental model of subjects randomly assigned either to an experimental or control treatment with dependent variable measures to be taken before and after various phases of treatment.

Step			
1	Screening for Eligibility	All Possible Subjects	
2	Random Assignment	Experimental Group	Control Group
3	Pretests (Appendix A)		
4	Treatment	RYT Program	Regular Jail Program
5	Evaluation Prior to Release	All RYT	All Controls
6	Release in the Community	All RYT	All Controls
7	One Year Follow-up	All RYT	All Controls

TABLE IA

SAMPLE IN EACH CYCLE OF TRAINING

CYCLE	EXPERIMENTALS	CONTROLS
I	29	28
II	18	18
III	21	23
IV	28	19
V	20	17
VI	21	22
TOTALS	137	127

Thus, every eligible youth was included in the study. This sample was probably representative of 40% of the population in this age group who pass through Rikers Island. It may not be representative of the 60% who had sentences too short to be included in the training program or who could not pass the IBM and Beta screening tests.

Selection of the Study Group

A staff member of the RYT project attended meetings of the Rikers Island Classification Board as the records of newly arrived inmates were reviewed. The Classification Board is made up of representatives from social service, custodial, rehabilitation and work assignment units in the institution. A representative from the New York City Parole Board also attends the meetings. Inmates were identified as potential candidates for RYT if they met the following criteria:

1. No outstanding legal process or pending warrant which might prevent scheduled release or job placement.
2. Age - between 16th and 22nd birthdays
3. No gross physical or psychological pathology as determined by the official intake procedures at the institution.
4. A parent, guardian, adult sibling or relative living in New York City who could serve as a resource and point of contact.
5. Subject would be on Rikers Island long enough to participate in a full training cycle.

Inmates who qualified under these basic criteria were given the IBM Aptitude Test and the Revised Beta Test of Intelligence. Those who received a passing grade on the IBM test (15 or above) and who had an I.Q. score of 80 or above were included in the pool of eligible research candidates.

Individuals who passed these tests received a group orientation lecture regarding the program. Subsequently, each one was interviewed separately by a member of the RYT staff and an Intake Record Sheet was filled out. The pool of eligibles was randomly divided into control and experimental groups. The inmates were then told that due to space and machine limitation, only half of their number could be accepted. Those assigned to the experimental group were told the plan of the program and were given an opportunity to withdraw. No one withdrew at this point. (After training had been started, some trainees did decide to withdraw.)

Forty percent of those taking the qualifying tests passed.

Though many youths otherwise eligible were spending time on Rikers Island it was difficult to find a sufficient number of potential trainees whose sentences coordinated with the beginning of a training cycle. As a result, the total anticipated sample of 300 experimentals and controls was not achieved. Out of the total institution population of 660 youths that was available, 264 were able to meet the initial selection criteria and also passed the IBM Aptitude and Beta IQ tests. This number constituted the total study sample which was divided into 137 experimentals and 127 controls. The distribution according to training cycle is shown in Table 1A.

Subjects Providing Data for Each Measure:

TABLE 1B

	Pre-Experiment		Post-Experiment	
Sources of Data	Exp's	Controls	Exp's	Controls
Possible Subjects	137	127	107	127*
Beta Test of Intelligence	120	110		
Gates Reading Test	120	99	82	32
IBM Aptitude Test	120	122	89	37
Follow-up Subject Interviews			83	76
Follow-up Parent Interviews			86	93
Follow-up Employer Interviews			83	38
Contact with Legal Agencies	137	127	All but 19 with no legal history after release	

*This is a maximum estimate since it was not possible to trace the number of deaths, a significant factor in this group.

Sources of Attrition in the Experimental Group

TABLE 1C

NUMBER OF RYT TRAINEES COMPLETING TRAINING

CYCLE	Started	Dropouts	Completed
I	29	0	29
II	18	7	11
III	21	4	17
IV	28	4	24
V	20	5	15
VI	21	5	16
TOTALS	137	25[1]	112

[1] Includes 5 Administrative Withdrawals

Evaluation Instruments

1. IBM Aptitude Test
2. Beta Test of Intelligence
3. Gates
4. Subject Interview Schedule - 123 item interview schedule. (See Appendix A)
5. Parent Interview Schedule - 64 item interview schedule. (See Appendix A)
6. Employer Interview Schedule - 116 item interview schedule. (See Appendix A)

Data Analysis

All items of information were coded and transposed to punch cards for computer analysis. Since the social case

(17)

history materials and data elicited from the interviews were discontinuous data, a chi-square analysis was used for tests of statistical significance of observed differences. Since the psychological test scores properly could be assumed to be continuous data represented by cardinal numbers "t" tests of statistical significance were used.

The multiple regression analysis was based on a correlation matrix using Pearsonian correlations.[3]

---

[3] Draper, N. R. & Smith, H., Applied Regression Analysis, J. Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966, N. Y.

The IBM Training Program

Instruction took place on Rikers Island, in a building separate from the remainder of the institution. This building was a wood-frame stucco cottage with ordinary doors and windows. There were no iron bars or locking devices. The building had little resemblance to the institution's attached housing units. At an earlier time it was used as a house when staff were required to live on Rikers Island.

Major classroom sessions were separated by the lunch period. Morning and afternoon segments were sub-divided by a 15 minute rest period. Class was held 5 days per week, excluding holidays. The study sample was sub-divided into 6 training cycles. Each cycle lasted 8 calendar weeks and consisted of 22 days of IBM machine training and 22 days of IBM machine practice time. The inmates received instruction on the following IBM equipment:

Model Number	Model Name
026	Key Punch
514	Reproducing Punch
082	Sorter with Counter
402/407	Alphabetical Accounting Tabulator
056	Verifier
085	Collator

At the start of the first cycle of training, the instructors tried to use the standard approaches used by the IBM Corporation in training. The approach was too abstract for the jailed population. Staff discovered that much greater opportunity had to be provided for seeing, touching, and handling the machines and cards before they could return to the classroom situation. Getting trainees to use the manuals also was difficult. The similarity to school books was handicapping. Within this general modification, however, the following basic curriculum was carried out.

Curriculum Outline

1. Introduction to punch card accounting:
    a. Explanation of punch card accounting, types of reports.
2. Introduction to and Explanation of the nature of punch cards:
    a. How a card is made.
    b. The different codes necessary to make up the alphabet.
3. The operations and use of Card Punch Machines (026) and Verifiers (056):
    a. Theory - General introduction to the 026 Key Punch (Key Punch in classroom).
    b. Theory - Miscellaneous operating features (Keyboard outline - How keys are arranged - functional keys).
    c. Practice exercise from "IBM Keyboard Exercises" for card punching machines (numeric).
    d. Theory - Program Drum Unit.
    e. Practice exercises from "IBM Card Punch Practice Exercises" Payroll, Sales and Invoice Procedures. (Alphabetic and Numeric).
4. The operation of Interpreters (548):
    a. How a card is interpreted, how many print positions, etc.

(87)

5. The Operation of Sorters (082-083):

   a. Proper sorting methods.
   b. Block sorting.

6. The operation of Collators (077-085):

   a. Sequence checking a file of cards.
   b. Merging to files of cards.
   c. Merging with selection.

7. The operation of Automatic Punches (513-514-519):

   a. Gang punching.
   b. Reproducing.
   c. Interspersed gang punching.

8. The operation of Accounting Machines (402-403-407):

   a. Addition and subtraction.
   b. Co-selectors, Pilot selectors.
   c. Comparing relays, etc.

9. The fundamentals and Proper Methods of Central Panel Wiring:

   a. Interpreters.
   b. Automatic Punchers.
   c. Collators.
   d. Accounting Machines.
   e. Calculators.

10. Procedures, Application, and Flow Charting.

Trainees were taught to analyze each operation, to develop and program the operation schematically, to wire the control panel and to do the job. An attempt was made to stay close to practical applications and to show how each operation and machine would be used in industry.

Machine training of the first cycle of students began December 9, 1963. Two part-time instructors on loan from the IBM Corporation taught the classes until January 15th, at which time the permanent full-time instructor joined the staff.

After his arrival, it became possible to provide additional classwork one night a week so that the weaker students could be given special attention.

At the end of each week an examination was given which consisted of fifty multiple choice questions and one wiring problem for each of the machines. The results were reviewed by the instructor and students, with the errors discussed in detail.

During the last week of the course, a final examination was given consisting of twenty-five multiple choice questions and six wiring problems. The final test grades were evaluated along with all other previous grades for a final course grade.

During the period between cycles, students who were not paroled were rotated in groups of six and worked on actual job applications for the Department of Correction. To carry out these assignments, flow charts were made up and specification books were written by the trainees. This and all other work necessary to produce the final data tabulations was done under the supervision of the training instructor.

Preliminary training procedures on the basic operations of the 1401 Computer were started during the second cycle and continued in subsequent cycles. This addition to the program was intended to give the trainees information concerning the basic concepts underlying computing operations and information about the components of the computer system.

Remedial Reading

Although the emphasis in IBM machine training is on the acquisition of manual skills, a great deal of reading is required. Youth in jail are often non-readers. Most of the trainees showed marked deficiencies in reading skills and were surprised by the amount of reading matter they were expected to digest. It was difficult to get them to spend any time in reading that was not scheduled for them. Some of this difficulty was probably due to the fact that at the close of the day, the trainee group returned to the cellblocks housing the general inmate population. One of the trainees described the problem faced by the study group very well. He said, "It was hard to read and study with all the other guys not in the program around every night. I could lay in the bunk at night and see the lights of the city ... you begin thinking of Mom and Pop... and I'm locked up here ... and kids are roaming around outside. Instead of studying you go and start talking."

Considerable difficulty was encountered in trying to fit the program into the most effective relationship with machine training. When the reading program was first scheduled to run currently with machine training, the reading classes were held at night. The program was then viewed as overtaxing both by staff and trainees. When remedial reading was given subsequent to completion of the IBM course, the boys did not do as well in assimilating the IBM material. Therefore, it appears logical to put the reading before IBM training. However, where this is done, motivation to acquire this academic skill falters because the trainee has no frame of reference to enable him to see the direct relation to the IBM training. Even though there were complaints about the long day when the reading classes were scheduled at night, from the point of view of motivation to read, concurrent reading and machine training appears to be best. Boys are motivated to learn to read when they are actually engaged with the machines and as they discover that competence with the machines depends on reading.

The RYT remedial reading program utilized two programmed instruction systems developed by Science Research Associates: Reading Laboratory III a, and Reading for Understanding. (See Appendix D)

In addition to the starting level guide tests which provided approximate achievement scores for beginning in both the Reading Laboratory and the Reading for Understanding program, the Gates Reading Survey was administered. These tests were administered at the start of the program.

The instructor had each trainee sit in a large room, with good lighting, and work with their own booklets. Each individual took and marked his own test, with the instructor circulating around answering questions and supervising the operation. Though intended to be a self-administered program, the presence of the instructor was important. Some of the boys lacked confidence and needed support. For some of the boys, it was a particularly good experience to be able to shift between accepting the instructor and actively rejecting him. Finally, in every group a few boys were so unmotivated that without the instructor there would have been no effort to read. During the second and fourth cycles, the programs took place in the evening or late afternoons for periods of 2 hours each, until a minimum of 20 hours had been accumulated. As noted above, this was a time of complaint. For the fifth and sixth cycles, the program was administered (still concurrently with machine training) on Monday, Wednesday and Friday mornings for periods of one and one-half hours, until the 20 hours had been accumulated. The latter seemed to be a more satisfactory plan because it created less fatigue and allowed time for reading supplementary material on non-course days.

Upon completion of the program, the trainees were again tested by an alternate form of the Gates Reading Test to measure any change in speed, vocabulary or comprehension.

Guidance and Counseling

Individual choice and exercise of personal judgement are severely limited in a jail setting. This tends to reinforce the prisoner's expectation that he is a pawn of society and, therefore, cannot plan his own future.

It was hypothesized that such attitudes and expectations diminish capacities to set long-term goals and create barriers to effective communication with employers, social agency personnel, police, parole officers and other social superiors when inmates return to the community. The project, therefore, sought ways to develop self-determining roles and a more optimistic orientation to the future in the trainees. A guidance

83

and counseling program was established with specific responsibility to develop programs helpful in this area. Three types of staff-trainee interaction were evolved: Group meetings, scheduled personal interviews and spontaneous, "spot" counseling contacts.

Group meetings were held in the evenings and during the week-ends. Originally, the intention was to discuss structured content along topics pre-determined by the RYT staff. After the first days of operation, a decision was reached to permit content to evolve in terms of the specific pressures and concerns the trainees were experiencing. This proved to be an important learning experience for staff. An excerpt from an early report gives a flavor of what was going on:

> "Staff was surprised by the depth and intensity of feelings expressed by the trainees - there was an utter disbelief that people would help them to the extent of the goal of the RYT project.... trainees either subtly or directly challenged RYT staff with: "What are you getting out of this?"; "Why are you doing this for me?" "Show me first, then I'll believe the pitch."; I'll go along with this snow job, but why take me?".

A second excerpt illustrates the way staff was perceived by the boys and documents the fact that the RYT staff did not know much about the social structure and emotional climate of a jail.

> "What has become apparent is that the transition from prison routine to an environment where the custodial officer appears in civilian clothes, where trainees are addressed as Mister, and where they are treated with respect and interest, represents a situation which is alien to the group as a whole. For the first two weeks, the silence at the dinner table could be sliced, and was anxiety-producing to RYT staff who ate with the trainees. Shortly thereafter, the reason for the silence become

> clear - one simply did not talk in the presence of an institutional authority figure.
>
> At the present moment, meal times now have the sound and noise of people who are learning to become unafraid."

Self-Management

The self-management program was initiated during the second cycle. At the outset it was conducted as a relatively informal group discussion. Later cycles involved a more formal presentation. This happened because the group refused to participate in informal discussion. Discussions of release were unreal, in part because they did not have experiences which could serve as a basis for discussion.

The first group met on Tuesday and Thursday evenings for 2 hour sessions. Discussion began with a brief summary by each individual of his background and the offense for which he was committed. Then each one was asked to state the problems they thought they were likely to face when they left the institution. These were discussed in order of importance to the participants. Following this, the instructor suggested the following topics and the group divided into smaller groups to discuss how each might be handled:

1. How to look for a job.
2. How to act in an interview.
3. How to dress.
4. How to handle and budget money.
5. How to stay out of trouble.

The Self-Management groups of the last three cycles were structured differently. The instructor was more directive than before. The topics to be discussed were outlined. Added to the original topics were: Arithmetic, Banking and Insurance Procedures, Loans, Use of Leisure Time, and Government and Citizenship. For each segment of the outline, an informal lesson plan and quizzes were prepared. The sessions generally were conducted on Monday, Wednesday and Friday afternoons for 2 hours each day, until at least 20 hours had been accumulated. There was no final exam in this section of the program.

Job Placement

The Job Placement Counselor had four primary functions: (1) To find appropriate jobs in the community; (2) To establish good working relationships for RYT among employers; (3) To counsel and help the trainee to aid him to become a desirable employee and; (4) To conduct follow-up interviews with the employers.

The Job Placement Counselor utilized a variety of resources to find positions for RYT trainees. Major types of contacts included:

1. The New York State Employment Service.
2. Organizations which have IBM equipment located in the New York area, (e.g.) airlines, insurance companies, trade and service bureaus.
3. Private fee-charging placement agencies specializing in IBM positions.
4. Large commercial organizations such as banks, insurance companies and utilities.

5. Civil Service organizations in New York City and State.

6. Trade-union locals and the New York City Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO.

7. The "Want Ad" Columns in the New York Times.

Explanatory letters were sent to Personnel Directors, where positions might be available, asking for personal interviews. A phone call followed and a visit made if it was invited. Some firms recommended the RYT job developer to other firms. Approximately 450 different companies were contacted in the search for jobs. Less than 8% of these gave jobs to trainees.

As evidence of the intensive effort necessary to make job placements in the community, during the period of time when the job placement staff was functioning most effectively, it still required an average of 29.9 personal, phone, and mail contacts for each boy placed. An average of 18.1 contacts per boy were made directly with business firms or governmental agencies using IBM equipment for each placement.

Significantly, a number of placements with New York City agencies were temporary because of civil service regulations which do not allow permanent status to be given to persons with histories of criminal convictions. Subsequently, three of the five young men who held such provisional appointments were released despite the fact that their supervisors said they were performing satisfactorily because they were not allowed to qualify for the examination for their positions. Private agencies were more flexible in adjusting to, or waiving the offense record of trainees. As with the city agencies, federal government agencies were also bound by rigid hiring regulations relating to written test requirements, experience qualifications and disqualification of specific types of offenders. In effect, the government agencies, who are prime users of the type of skill being developed in RYT, failed to develop the flexibility and leadership necessary to meet the challenge that was presented. Private industry, rather grudgingly, was more supportive and perceptive of the potential gains for society.

The first job placement interview with the trainee took place a day or two after his release from the institution. With the general history of the individual and his performance in the RYT project in mind, the counselor explored the trainee's past, present and future work aspiration levels, and tried to develop a vocational plan. During the interview, the trainee filled out an information sheet which was converted to a resume. A copy was sent to prospective employers. In addition, the trainee practiced filling out a job application form. Sometimes, the counselor "role-played" an interview situation to help the trainee overcome any nervousness he might feel. He talked with the boy about how he might conduct himself in an interview, emphasizing the importance of keeping an appointment and being punctual.

The trainee was given available job leads. On many occasions, the counselor accompanied the trainee to the interview appointment; to offer moral support and also to be sure that he arrived on time and in proper dress.

On occasion it has been suggested that the population of which RYT was a sample are not motivated to succeed. The job development staff indicate that this may be due to a profound fear of trying for a job where discrimination or rejection may be involved. They take each step reluctantly and uncertainly. Most trainees did not have the ego-strength (tolerance of anxiety) nor social experience to move alone into the level of open competition in the labor market that was pressed upon them by RYT. Much of their "forgetting" of appointments and inappropriate dress for appointments seemed to have this fear as a base.

Social Service Coordination

In original conception, RYT social service activities were to be referring, coordinating and facilitating functions rather than direct service functions. It was expected that working arrangements with already existing social service agencies in the community could be developed. Through careful review, selected referrals and follow-up, RYT trainees would be helped to find the kind of individually "tailored" services that each boy would need. Research data also were to be elicited from the various service agencies that were involved.

Further, since one of the key concepts in RYT involved helping clients to develop a personally meaningful and integrated relationship with the community, obviously it was more appropriate to act as a bridge to already established services rather than to try to supply all needs within RYT itself. At the same time RYT could provide continuity to make sure that needs were not lost in "red-tape" and processing concerns.

To carry out these objectives, a survey was made to locate community agencies [illegible] social service organizations. Unfortunately, despite the fact that a number of agencies expressed a willingness to cooperate, they were limited in their capacity to respond. For example, several agencies that were contacted for help indicated that they were struggling with many of the same problems. Agencies with both institutional and community service programs often indicated that they felt that rehabilitative gains with a youngster while he was in residence were dissipated because they were unable to make a suitable home placement for the boy when he was released. (Appendix E)

Faced by the reality that most community agencies already had exhausting case-loads, long waiting lists, unfilled staff lines and tightly drawn budgets, RYT began to try to reduce the rapidly accumulating backlog of service needs by using its own staff resources to render direct service to subject-clients. The result was that staff worked very hard, but having spread themselves across so many functions, both research and service aspects of the program suffered.[3]

---

[3] Profiting from this experience, a subsequent research project has developed contracts with the Board of Education and with the Parole Commission to supply a particular quality and type of service to experimental subjects. In these contracts, matching contributions from research project funds and agency funds have been set up. (e.g.) in setting up a special Parole unit of eight officers and one supervisor, a contract was developed in which Parole furnished four officers and half the money to pay the supervisor while the research project provided money to hire four other officers and half of the supervisor's salary.

One RYT staff member was assigned to provide pre-release services to trainees who were currently undergoing training. He also conducted research interviews when necessary and acted as liaison with the jail's Adolescent Division administration.

A second RYT staff member was assigned to follow Parole Commission activity as it affected RYT subjects and activities. It was his duty to keep track of release dates for trainees and to arrange for an RYT representative to be present at the Parole Commission offices on the release date. He also was responsible for collecting data regarding the control group. Information for this group was gathered from Parole files and interviews with the Parole Officers, since direct contact with the controls was avoided during this phase of the project. In the case of the 10% who were not on parole, information was gathered from other social agencies and from the files at the Department of Correction. This investigator was notified by the Parole Commission when an RYT trainee was rearrested or considered for parole revocation.

Just prior to release, an appointment was scheduled with each trainee. During this interview, the trainee was given a list of appointments and written traveling instructions to facilitate subsequent contacts with:

1. The social service worker in the field offices.[4]
2. The job placement counselor.
3. The RYT dentist (or dental clinic, if obvious and immediate dental care was indicated).
4. Temporary housing. If needed, arrangements were made immediately.

The first social service interview in the field was supposed to be scheduled no later than two days after the trainee's release. At this interview the social worker tried to get an understanding of the individual's situation as he had actually experienced it following release. An attempt was made to determine whether housing was adequate, whether family rapport was good, whether expense money was available to the trainee until he found a position, and whether the trainee had a wardrobe adequate for a job interview. If unanticipated housing difficulties had arisen, arrangements were made with the local Y.M.C.A. to provide a room. When clothes were required, the trainee and an RYT staff member went to a discount clothier and purchased what was required. This usually included a coat in wintertime, a jacket, shoes, shirts, slacks and underclothes. Conservative styles and colors were selected with a job interview in mind.

---

[4] Field offices had been established in a neighborhood that was close to one of the sections of the city where many RYT clients and their families lived. With the cooperation of the New York City Department of Real Estate, facilities for the follow-up/aftercare program were made available without charge. A former store, measuring approximately 20' wide by 60' long, was remodeled and renovated to afford space for five offices, a reception room and a waiting room. Located in the upper West End of the Borough of Manhattan, it was readily accessible by several bus lines and two subways.

Arrangements were made with a local dentist whereby RYT paid for half of the bill as a loan to the trainee who paid the remaining half directly to the dentist.

Trainees might borrow up to $20.00 per week for living expenses if it was needed. In a similar case of need, a trainee with drug history could receive a daily stipend of no more than $2.50 per day (plus carfare) if he reported each day to the Field Office. The total amount of money generally loaned was not to exceed $150.00. However, this might go to $200.00 when dental or housing expenses were necessary. When the trainee had received his first paycheck he was no longer eligible for loans. As he was able he was to repay the loans which had been made. Most of the trainees did not repay the money loaned to them. In retrospect, it probably was naive to assume that they would. Their salary levels were low. Their immediate needs for money were great because of the cost of living. Moreover, the staff was ambivalent about seriously trying to collect loans. They had identified themselves as a service and "giving" agency. They had no experience with this kind of problem. It seemed contradictory to adopt the practices of a collection agenty (e.g.) meeting the boy on payday and requiring him to pay. This was done a few times in the earlier phases of the project and was not regarded pleasantly by staff. Later as other activities began to consume more time, personal follow-up was entirely dropped. Subsequently a series of letters pointing out that lack of repayment deprived other trainees was tried unsuccessfully. Finally, the whole matter was ignored. The gross dollars expended was $5,820.45 - the amount paid back was $140.83. However, during the final follow-up study it developed that most of the boys who had dental work done, had paid the half of the dentist bill that was owed directly to the dentist.

In cases where initial post-release interviews indicated a need for family counseling, arrangements were made to see the parents. This required collateral work with the Department of Welfare, Child Guidance Board, and the City Courts. Cooperative working relationships were established with the following agencies:

1. Board of Education
    (a) Bureau of Child Guidance
    (b) Bureau of Attendance
2. Protective
    (a) New York City Parole Commission
    (b) New York City Probation Department
3. Department of Welfare
4. Department of Health
    (a) Hospitalization
    (b) Narcotics Centers
5. Urban League
6. ACCEPT (Alcoholism Clinic)
7. Legal Aid
8. YMCA
9. Catholic Charities
10. Jewish Board of Guardians
11. Protestant Welfare

12. Social Service Exchange

Many RYT families were involved with several agencies and programs in the community. Working with all overlapping agency contacts created an almost impossible task for the limited number of RYT workers available in the project.

Tremendous difficulty was encountered in moving trainees and their families into relationships with community resources where they might obtain the kind of help necessary to reinforce positive gains introduced by training and job placement. These families and individuals do not seek out treatment and will not ask relief until they are faced with a particularly distressing situation. Often they seem to resign themselves to living with their problems until they come to the attention of outside agencies, e.g.: schools, courts, welfare, etc. Family-agency contact generally appears to be a reaction to agency interest rather than a planned effort to remedy problems. Only when a family problem explodes or when family members are directed by the courts, do they "seek" help.

Not only the trainees but also the family must be considered in the restoration process. Even in those instances where the employment opportunities offered RYT youth were of a type which supported upward mobility, home and neighborhood environments tended to militate against mobility. Experimentally induced 'stimuli' of training and placement do not seem to be enough to overcome or counteract the torpor that can be produced by the family-youth relationship. The home-neighborhood environment introduces a "drag effect" that is not alleviated by limited follow-up services. It became clear that job training, education and counseling provide only a starting point for overcoming virtually a generation of fear and resignation. It was impossible to provide the broad program of follow-up which should include the family in an ongoing process of education and socialization so that the youth and his family may jointly perceive alternatives for action or the youth may develop enough strength and support so that he may risk a shift from the family patterns and location.

Termination of Services

All post-release services were extended only to the trainee who had completed his IBM training and were continued until six months after his release from the institution. A phase out interview was held at the conclusion of the six month period, for those boys who remained in contact. At this time the trainee described his experiences with the program, and discussed his future. The trainee was then told that the resources and objectives of the RYT program were such that further extensive work with each trainee was, unfortunately, not available. He then was told whom to contact in the community, should further difficulties arise.

Difficulties in Maintaining Contact with Trainees

Once the trainee had been released from jail, the project staff found that it was more difficult to contact the trainee than had been anticipated. Since the RYT program was not part of Parole requirements, post-release contact with research personnel was not viewed by the trainee as being necessary to him.

The lack of a sound working relationship with Parole was unfortunate. If the necessity for the involvement of Parole had been recognized and accepted from the outset, many later problems might have been totally avoided. Even though there is much that can be criticized in modern parole practice, the New York City Parole Commission is not able to marshall the resources and personnel that are available even at the State level. However, in retrospect it is obvious that RYT would have benefitted by a more coordinated relationship and a better pattern of communication with Parole services.

As long as money was doled out, the trainees kept interview appointments, but once re-established in the community, the average RYT boy was difficult to reach. Address changes occurred frequently. Many did not have telephones.

Parly because of such prior difficulty, it was decided that greater cooperation could be "generated" in the later follow-up interviews if both the subjects and their families could be paid for talking with the research interviewer. Accordingly, each person granting an interview received $5.00. On the whole, this incentive, while not large, was helpful. Responses were varied. One angry mother refused to talk with the interviewer and commented, "I don't know where that boy is - and five dollars isn't enough to make me want to remember him." Several parents refused payment because they felt that the program had helped the boy and they wanted to be helpful without pay in return. Still others refused the check because it was issued in the name of the Staten Island Mental Health Society and they were afraid that in cashing it the stigma of "mental" would be fixed on them or their family. The news of payment sometimes was passed between subjects and several people called, as a result, to tell of new addresses and to arrange for an appointment. Finally, one energetically co-operative young man allowed himself to be interviewed by two different interviewers.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

Who goes to jail: characteristics of the general population of inmates in the New York City Reformatory at Rikers Island.

At the inception of RYT there was no adequate means of describing the general population of young offenders serving sentences in the Reformatory at Rikers Island.[1] Some minimal statistical data regularly was compiled by the jail for management purposes, but demographic and social history information was not systematically collected and recorded.

Largely as a result of the stimulus provided by RYT and with the prospect of a data processing division being developed on Rikers Island, the Department of Correction Reception Center and Rehabilitation staff developed a standard demographic form for use at intake in the Reception Center.

During the first several months after the form was introduced the staff maintained a consistent and accurate pattern of completing the demographic interview on every inmate received into the jail. Subsequently, loss of staff decreased the time available for ensuring accuracy. When it appeared that the data would not be used in evaluation of the program the early enthusiasm for the assignment waned along with accuracy and completeness.

---

[1] As was noted in the early pages of this report, this is a condition which is characteristic in jails everywhere.

When staff vacancies had been filled there was a brief resurgence of interest, but shortly this was again dissipated by the lack of feedback. The already completed forms were filed in the individual case folders. Thereafter the forms were completed irregularly.

Later, when the question of randomness of the RYT sample became a matter of concern it was decided that this demographic data on the general population might be used to provide baseline information against which the characteristics of RYT might be compared. Approximately 4000 demographic interviews had been recorded during periods when the Reception Center had been fully staffed. Supervisory staff were sure that the records during these periods were accurate and complete. These periods covered winter, spring and fall intake in 1964. Summer records were deemed unreliable. A random 25% sample of records was taken from the months when accuracy and detail were assured.[2] The original demographic interview form was used along with F.B.I. reports which had been received and

---

[2] It may be that intake is different during June, July, August and September but in the interest of reliability it was decided to assume there would be no real variation.

TABLE 2

Ethnic Group Membership
of Inmates and Place of Birth (1964)

	Ethnic Group Membership							
Place of Birth	White No.	White %	Negro No.	Negro %	Puerto Rican No.	Puerto Rican %	Chinese No.	Chinese %
New York City	207	82	308	60	17	7	0	0
Northeast States	15	6	21	4	1	.4	0	0
Southeast States	7	3	142	27	0	0	0	0
Midwest & West	3	1	16	3	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	6	2	22	4	216	92	0	0
Foreign & Other	16	6	9	2	0	0	1	100
TOTAL	254	100	518	100	234	99.4	1	100

---

p=.001
df=15

filed in the Department of Correction case folders; Probation Office, Court and Parole records were also used to verify information reported in the interview. 1008 cases were included in this sample. This is as close to a representative sample of intake at the New York City Reformatory at Rikers Island during 1964 as can probably be obtained.

Place of Birth & Ethnic Group Membership of Reformatory Inmates

From the demographic data, the picture emerges that the largest percentage of young adults serving time in the New York City jail are from disadvantaged groups in society. Thus, nearly three-fourths of the young men in this sample are minority group members. The majority (52%) were born in New York City. (Table 2) However, 24% were born in Puerto Rico and 15% in the Southeastern States. While most of the inmates born in the South are Negro, nearly two-thirds of the total number of Negroes in jail were born in New York City. This is not the case with the Puerto Rican group in jail; 92% of the Puerto Ricans in jail were born in Puerto Rico. The data do not clarify the contribution of dislocation as different from disadvantage as a factor in deviance.

These statistics take on greater significance however when they are examined in their relationship to grade level achievement in school, participation in the world of work, and criminal history.

Grade Level Achievement in School

There is a significant relationship between place of

TABLE 3

Highest School Grade Completed
by Inmates and Places of Birth (1964)

Place of Birth

Highest Grade Completed	New York City		Northeast		Southeast		West		Puerto Rico		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Elementary School	42	8	5	13	14*	9	0	0	58**	24	2	8
Junior High School	84	16	5	13	30	20	4	21	63	26	4	17
High School	403	76	27	73	104	70	14	74	122	50	18	75
Some College	1	.2	0	0	1	.7	1	5	0	0	0	0
Not Stated	2	.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	.8	0	0
TOTAL	532	100.6	37	99	149	99.7	19	100	245	100.8	24	100

$p=.001$
$df=20$

*includes 1 with no formal education completed

**includes 2 with no formal education completed birth and the highest level of school work completed. Half of the inmates born in Puerto Rico have dropped out of school before entering high school, and 29% of those born in the Southeastern states also drop out (Table 3) at this level.

The median number of school years completed by the inmate population as a whole is nearly 9.9. This is about one grade level below the levels reported for all males 14 to 24 in the New York Standard Metropolitan area in the 1960 Census. The census reported that white males, 14 to 24, had completed a median of 10.9 school years; non-white males had completed a median of 10.5.[3] However, the relationship between white and non-white on this statistic is reversed in the jail population. There is a slight tendency for the Negro inmate to reach a higher grade level in school than does the white inmate. If this bit of information is considered in relation to the previously noted lower educational achievement of the southern born group in the jail population, and the preponderance of Negroes in this southern-born group, it would appear that Negro inmates born in New York City and the Northeastern states do tend to stay in school longer than white jail inmates. It may be that they are more representative of general Negro population in New York City, while the white inmate may represent a particular segment.

---

[3] Bureau of Census 1960 Census of Population. Table 103 pp. 34-461, 34-462

TABLE 4

Ethnic Group Membership of Inmates and Highest School Grade Completed (1964)

School Grade Completed	Ethnic Group Membership							
	White		Negro		Puerto Rican		Chinese	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Some Elementary School	25	10	37*	7	59**	25	0	0
Junior High School	42	17	82	16	66	28	0	0
High School	185	73	396	76	107	46	1	100
Some College	2	.8	1	.2	0	0	0	0
Not Stated	0	0	2	.4	2	.9	0	0
TOTAL	254	100.8	518	99.6	234	99.9	1	100

$p=.001$
$df=12$

*includes 1 with no formal education completed
**includes 2 with no formal education completed

This evidence supports the position presented earlier that these boys have greater difficulties in school which are of the management or disciplinary variety as the evidence on intelligence will bear out.

Grade Level Achievement and IQ Scores

In the present data (Table 5), there is a tendency toward a positive relationship between years of school completed and scores on the Beta Test of Intelligence but not statistically significant. The median IQ score of the inmates in the reformatory falls in the Low Average to Dull range of intelligence. These findings tend to confirm previous observations that leaving school at earlier ages is not really a function of basic incapacity in this population.

Participation in the World of Work

The majority of inmates in the reformatory have prior work experience. However, 35% of the group were unemployed at the time of their arrest. (Table 6) Further, most of them were working in occupations that require little skill and which have the highest unemployment rates. (Table 7) The relationship between education and effective participation in the world of work is clearly indicated for this population by the data in Tables 7, 8 & 9. The inmates with the least education are working at service and laborer jobs. They also earned less than other inmates. The average salary earned on jobs prior to arrest for inmates who have not progressed beyond junior high school is less than 45 dollars a week. It

TABLE 5

Beta I.Q. Scores of Inmates and Highest School Grade Completed (1964)

Highest School Grade Completed	Beta I.Q. Scores Below 80 No.	 %	 81-90 No.	 %	 91-100 No.	 %	 101-110 No.	 %	 111-120 No.	 %	 121+ No.	 %
Grade School	19	28	9	10	9	8	7	6	4	7	0	0
Jr. High School	14	21	19	21	25	22	17	15	6	11	1	20
High School	33	49	61	68	82	71	89	78	43	80	4	80
Some College	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0
Not Stated	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	.9	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	67	99	90	100	116	101	114	99.9	54	100	5	100

---

p=.10
df=20

TABLE 6

Highest School Grade Completed by Inmates and Employment Status at Time of Arrest (1964)

Employment Status at Time of Arrest	Elem. School No.	Elem. School %	Jr. High School No.	Jr. High School %	High School No.	High School %	Some College No.	Some College %	Not Stated No.	Not Stated %
	Highest School Grade Completed									
Employed	83	69	119	63	441	64	2	67	2	50
Unemployed	38	31	70	37	246	36	1	33	1	25
Not Stated	0	0	1	.5	3	.4	0	0	1	25
TOTAL	121*	100	190	100.5	690	100.4	3	100	4	100

---

p=.25
df=12

* includes 3 with no formal education completed

TABLE 7

Highest School Grade Completed by Inmates and Classification of Last Employment (1964)

Classification of Last Employment Position	Elementary No.	Elementary %	Jr. High School No.	Jr. High School %	High School No.	High School %	Some College No.	Some College %	Not Stated No.	Not Stated %
	Highest School Grade Completed									
Professional, Managerial, Other	1	.8	0	0	18	3	0	0	0	0
Craft or Operator	15	12	31	16	93	13	0	0	0	0
Sales or Clerical	4	3	16	8	98	14	2	67	0	0
Service	15	12	40	21	127	18	0	0	2	50
Laborer	64	53	77	41	216	31	0	0	1	25
Student	1	.8	7	4	43	6	1	33	0	0
Not Stated	21	17	19	10	95	14	0	0	1	25
TOTAL	121*	98.6	190	100	690	99	3	100	4	100

---

p=.005
df=24

* includes 3 subjects with no formal education completed

TABLE 8

Highest School Grade Completed by Inmates and Earnings at Last Employment (1964)

Highest School Grade Completed

Earnings Per Week	Elementary No.	Elementary %	Jr. High School No.	Jr. High School %	High School No.	High School %	Some College No.	Some College %	Not Stated No.	Not Stated %
Under $40	8	7	18	9	60	9	1	33	0	0
$41-$60	46	38	77	41	197	29	0	0	0	0
$61-$80	24	20	42	22	169	24	0	0	2	50
$81 +	9	7	13	7	88	13	2	67	0	0
Not Stated	34	28	40	21	176	25	0	0	2	50
TOTAL	121*	100	190	100	690	100	3	100	4	100

$p=.25$
df=16

* includes 3 with no formal education completed

TABLE 9

Ethnic Group Membership of Inmates and Earnings at Last Job (1964)

Ethnic Group Membership

Earnings at Last Job	White No.	White %	Negro No.	Negro %	Puerto Rican No.	Puerto Rican %	Chinese No.	Chinese %
Below $40	14	6	58	11	15	6	0	0
$41-$60	65	26	158	31	95	41	1	.50
$61-$80	71	28	111	21	55	24	0	0
Over $80	49	19	49	9	14	6	0	0
Not Stated	55	22	142	27	55	24	1	.50
TOTAL	254	101	518	99	234	101	2	100

---

p=.001
df=12

TABLE 10

Number of Families of Inmates on Welfare
and Ethnic Group Membership (1964)

Families on Welfare	Ethnic Group Membership White No.	 %	 Negro No.	 %	 Puerto Rican No.	 %	 Chinese No.	 %
Yes	35	14	136	26	74	32	0	0
No	204	80	349	68	152	65	1	100
Not Stated	15	6	33	6	8	3	0	0
TOTAL	254	100	518	100	234	100	1	100

---

p=.001
df=6

TABLE 11

Number of Prior Convictions and Ethnic Group Membership of Inmates (1964)

Ethnic Group Membership	Prior Convictions None No.	None %	One No.	One %	Two or Three No.	Two or Three %	Four or More No.	Four or More %	Not Stated No.	Not Stated %
White	67	22	87	28	75	28	21	19	4	25
Negro	177	59	141	45	124	46	67	62	8	50
Puerto Rican	57	19	83	27	71	26	20	19	3	19
Chinese	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
TOTAL	301	100	311	100	270	100	108	100	16	100

---

p=.001
df=12

TABLE 12

Ethnic Group Membership and Patterns of Offense (1964)

Type of Offense	Ethnic Group Membership							
	White		Negro		Puerto Rican		Chinese	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Drug	34	13	53	10	41	18	0	0
Larceny	90	36	149	29	75	32	0	0
Assault	24	9	69	14	14	6	0	0
Disorderly Conduct	14	6	39	8	15	6	0	0
Sex	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	0
Robbery	4	2	18	4	10	4	0	0
Burglary	39	15	49	10	29	12	0	0
Other	49	19	129	24	50	21	1	100
TOTAL	254	100	518	101	234	99	1	100

---

p=.05
df=21

TABLE 13

Number of Prior Convictions

Drug Use (1964)

Drug Use	Prior Convictions									
	None		One		2 - 3		4 or More		Not Stated	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
None	231	77	220	71	142	53	45	42	13	81
Heroin	58	19	72	23	116	43	55	51	2	13
Morphine, etc.	2	.7	0	0	1	.4	1	.9	0	0
Marijuana	8	3	14	5	6	2	4	4	0	0
Barbiturate	1	.3	4	1	5	2	3	3	1	6
Peyote, LSD, etc.	1	.3	1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	301	100.3	311	100.3	270	100.4	108	100.9	16	100

p=.001
df=20

TABLE 14

Ethnic Group Membership and
Age of First Drug Use (1964)

Age	Ethnic Group Membership White No.	White %	Negro No.	Negro %	Puerto Rican No.	Puerto Rican %	Chinese No.	Chinese %
< 15	36	14	28	5	25	11	0	0
16-20	56	22	100	19	86	37	0	0
21-22	1	.4	3	.6	3	1	0	0
Not Stated or Not Applicable	161	63	387	75	120	51	1	100
TOTAL	254	99.4	518	99.6	234	100	1	100

---

p=.001
df=9

111

back up

TABLE 15

Age at First Drug Use and
Type of Drug Used (1964)

	Age First Drugs Used							
Type of Drugs	Below 15		16-20		21-22		Not Applicable Not Stated	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
None	1	1	2	.8	0	0	649	97
Heroin	80	91	202	83	6	86	15	2
Morphine	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	.1
Marijuana	6	7	22	9	1	14	3	.5
Barb. & Benz.	1	1	12	5	0	0	1	.1
Other	0	0	1	.4	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	88	100	242	99.2	7	100	669	99.7

---

p=.001
df=15

TABLE 16

Age at First Drug Use and Frequency of Drug Use at Time of Arrest (1964)

Frequency of Drug Use	Below 15 No.	Below 15 %	16-20 No.	16-20 %	21-22 No.	21-22 %	Not Applicable Not Stated No.	Not Applicable Not Stated %
	Age of First Drug Use							
Less than 12 times a year	6	7	23	9	1	14	1	.1
Twice a month-once a week	4	4	18	7	0	0	1	.1
Once a week or more	76	85	190	79	6	86	10	1
Not Stated or Not Applicable	3	3	11	5	0	0	657	98
TOTAL	89	99	242	100	7	100	669	99.2

p=.001
df=9

⑫

TABLE 17

Age of Inmates' First Drug Use and Average Daily Cost of Drugs (1964)

Average Daily Cost	Age at First Use of Drugs Below 15		16-20		21-22		Not Stated Not Applicable	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Below $15	34	38	112	46	3	43	2	.5
$15-30	40	45	75	31	3	43	4	.6
Above $30	9	10	22	9	0	0	0	0
Not Stated Not Applicable	6	7	33	14	1	14	663	99
TOTAL	89	100	242	100	7	100	669	100.1

---

p=.001
df=9

TABLE 18

Employment Status of Inmates With a History of Drug Use (1954)

	Drugs Used by Inmates											
Employment Status	None		Heroin		Morphine		Marijuana		Benzedrine Barbiturates		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Employed	448	69	168	55	2	50	17	53	9	64	2	.50
Unemployed	200	31	134	44	2	50	15	47	5	36	0	0
Not Stated	2	.3	1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	.50
TOTAL	650	100.3	303	99.3	4	100	32	100	14	100	2	100

p=.1
df=10

is obvious that even in a comparison of inmate with inmate, educational achievement differentiates those who are most likely to find stable, good-paying jobs.

Families on Welfare

Nearly one out of every four inmates in the reformatory sample indicated that their families were recipients of Welfare; 32% of the families of Puerto Rican inmates, 26% of the families of Negro inmates and 14% of the families of white inmates were receiving aid. This further documents the marginality of the social groups from which the offender emerges.

Previous Criminal History

More than one-third of the reformatory inmates had two or more prior convictions. (Table 11, See also Table 19) Another one-third had been convicted at least once before. The remaining one-third were offenders who were serving sentences for the first time. Clearly, the young offender in jail poses a real threat to society in the likelihood of recidivism.

The most frequent offenses committed by young offenders in the Reformatory were Larceny, Burglary, Drug violations and Assault. These same trends were apparent across all ethnic groups, although a slight tendency can be noted for white inmates to be involved in Larceny and Burglary to a greater degree, while Negro inmates are convicted more frequently on charges involving Assault and Puerto Rican inmates are convicted on Drug violations with somewhat greater frequency. (Table 12) One-third of the inmates in the sample had used

125

drugs. For most of them it was a fairly recent experience; the majority reported their first experience with drugs as beginning in the 16-20 age range. Moreover, 27% of the inmates reported using some sort of drug at least once every week. Eight out of every ten drug users reported that they had started by using heroin and 14% of the group estimated that they were spending more than 15 dollars a day to buy drugs. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that drug usage and number of prior convictions show a close relationship. (Table 13) Since the cost of supporting a drug habit of the size reported is more than twice the weekly legitimate earnings reported by this group as a whole, it is obvious that illegal ways of getting money would be used to get money to pay for the habit.

Comparison of Characteristics of RYT Subjects and General Population of Admissions to New York City Reformatory

The original pool of inmates eligible for RYT training consisted of 264 individuals. They were randomly allocated into experimental and control groups, 137 experimentals and 127 controls. Several sources of attrition reduced these numbers. Thus, out of the 137 subjects who began IBM training, only 112 completed it. Some withdrew voluntarily after brief experience with the actual program, some did not complete the program because they were released, and 6 out of the total 25 dropouts were administrative withdrawals initiated by Department of Correction personnel because of security violations.

TABLE 19

Comparison of RYT Subjects and Sample of General Admissions to N.Y.C. Reformatory in 1964

	General Intake		RYT	
Place of Birth	No.	%	No.	%
New York City & State	532	53	156	65
Puerto Rico	245	24	40	17
Other States	205	20	37	15
Foreign Country	21	2	8	3
Not Stated	5	.5		
TOTAL	1008	99.5	241	99
Ethnic Background				
White	254	25	95	39
Negro	518	51	94	39
Puerto Rican	234	23	54	22
Oriental	2	1	1	.4
TOTAL	1008	100	244	100.4
Age Median				
16	19	2	1	.4
17	137	14	4	2
18	163	16	62	26
19	164	16	64	26
20	216	22	69	29
21	197	19	34	14
22	103	10	2	.8
23	9	1	1	.4
Not Known	0	0	4	2
TOTAL	1008	100	241	100.6*

Beta I.Q. Scores	No.	%	No.	%
Less than 80	67	7	3	1
81-90	90	9	15	6
91-100	116	11	76	32
101-110	114	12	78	32
111-120	54	5	51	21
121+	5	.5	7	3
Not Known, Not Available	562	56	11	5
TOTAL	1008	100.5	241	100

Years of Education	No.	%	No.	%
None	3	.3	0	0
1-6	118	12	4	2
7-9	190	19	78	32
10-12	690	68	161	66
13-16	3	.3	1	.4
Not Known	4	.4	0	0
TOTAL	1008	100.1	241	100.4

Pattern of Offense				
Drug	128	13	15	6
Larceny	314	31	76	32
Assault	107	11	36	15
Disorderly Conduct	68	7	6	2
Sex	12	1	4	2
Robbery	32	3	10	4
Burglary	117	12	54	22
Non-Support	0	0	1	.4
Other	220	22	15	6
Not Known (includes commitment as Youthful Offender	10	1	24	10
TOTAL	1008	101	241	99.4

---

*The numbers reported in this table for RYT subjects are different from the numbers recorded in Table 21. Pattern of Offense as reported in this table includes only 1 offense per case. Table 21 reports multiple offenses.

TABLE 19 (continued)

Earnings at Last Employment Position per Week	General Intake		RYT	
	No.	%	No.	%
Less than $40	87	9	29	12
$41-60	320	32	93	38
$61-80	237	24	52	21
$81-100	73	7	12	5
$101+	39	4	5	2
Not Stated	252	25	50	22
TOTAL	1008	101	241	100

Religion				
Roman Catholic	538	53	144	62
Protestant	366	36	83	36
Jewish	11	1	2	.9
Muslim	20	2	2	.9
Other	9	1	0	0
None, Not Stated	64	6	15	0
TOTAL	1008	99	231*	99.8

Marital Status				
Single	846	84	215	89
Married & Common Law	138	13	22	9
Separated, Divorced	24	2	2	1
Not Stated	0	0	2	1
TOTAL	1008	99	241	100

Military History				
Served	38	4	12	5
Rejected	257	25	DATA NOT AVAILABLE	
Not Called	713	71		
TOTAL	1008	100	241	

---

*No further information available

121

3

Some procedural changes in sampling were forced by the fact that the pool of eligible subjects could not be selected completely and then held intact until all cycles of training were completed. As men became eligible for parole they left the institution. It became necessary to select eligibles and to randomize separately for each cycle. Further, because of a breach in security during the second training cycle, the administrative staff of the institution insisted that persons identified by them as security risks could not be included in the third, fourth, fifth and sixth cycles.

Because of such modifications the question arose as to whether the remaining 112 experimentals and 110 controls are random samples and representative of the universe from which they were drawn.

As may be seen by reference to Table 19 the RYT sample is similar in most respects to the large sample of the general population of young offenders committed to Rikers Island in 1964. Despite difficulties and procedural changes it would appear that RYT subjects were reasonably representative of the general population of young adults in jail.

Some differences should be noted: The number of Negroes in the general jail population is under represented in the RYT sample while the white population in jail is slightly over-represented. Such differences may have developed as one result of criteria used in selecting the group who would be offered training. These criteria may have eliminated some individuals who were most handicapped by conditions of social and cultural disadvantage.

A prerequisite for admission to RYT was a score on the IBM aptitude test which indicated that the individual could utilize the training materials that would be given him. This requirement undoubtedly eliminated some individuals with poor education and school experience.

The overall Grade-level achievement of the RYT sample is higher than the average in the reformatory sample. Thus, only 2% of the RYT group had less than 6 years of formal education. In contrast 12% of the reformatory sample were included in this category.

Nevertheless, even though RYT subjects may have more education and be a less handicapped group in the jail population, they had far less education than ordinarily would be considered appropriate for automatic data processing training. Fully a third of the RYT subjects had not completed the 10th grade.

Again, as with the reformatory group, intelligence, per se, does not seem to be a major determinant of grade-level achievement. The IQ scores of the RYT sample and the general reformatory sample are within a few points of each other. The mean IQ score in RYT was 103. The mean score of the general population sample was 98.

There were no significant differences between the two samples with regard to age. The median age of RYT subjects was between 21 and 22. This compares almost exactly with the median age of 21 for the general population.

Some differences appear with regard to the distribution of offense patterns. One of the most critical differences is that the RYT sample has a smaller percentage of persons convicted of drug violations. Such a difference might have been expected, since in the early days of the project, an attempt was made to limit the number of drug offenders who were admitted to the sample. It was felt that the problems of placement following training would be extreme. Subsequently this restriction was removed as it became clear that eliminating all drug users in the population would have made it impossible to collect a sufficient sample for training.

A greater proportion of RYT subjects were convicted of burglary than was true for the general sample. This may be related to the higher percentage of whites included in the RYT sample. There is a tendency for whites in the general population to commit burglaries with greater frequency than other ethnic groups.

A comparison of earnings on the last job before jail indicates that RYT subjects have been earning less than the total admissions group. Moreover, when the RYT sample is divided into experimental and control groups a larger proportion of the experimental RYT boys have been earning under $40 per week on their last job. This difference favors the control group. The experimental group would have to make a larger increase in earnings as a result of the RYT training to compensate for their handicap.

Finally, approximately the same proportions have served in the military. The numbers in either group are quite small. It is interesting to note that one out of every four young offenders has been rejected by the military. Comparable data is not available for RYT, however, it is obvious that these young men not only are not entering the world of work, but are being rejected for other avenues of activity as well.

Comparison of Experimental and Control Groups on Demographic and Background Data

On a majority of the demographic variables identified in the literature as possible correlates of recidivism, the statistical analysis of differences between experimental and control subjects indicates that the two groups are comparable in most respects. (Tables 20 - 42)

The distributions of age, place of birth, the number of years lived in New York City, ethnic group membership and religious affiliation are quite similar. (Tables 20, 21, 22)

The socio-economic background of the two groups appears essentially the same. Such socio-economic measures as father's occupation, mother's occupation, the job classification of the parents, job classification and earnings of the boys themselves prior to incarceration, and whether the boy lives alone or with parents or relatives show no differences that are large enough to cause concern. Variations seem to be almost equally distributed between the two groups. (See Tables 24,25,26,31,32)

TABLE 20

Place of Birth of RYT Subjects (1964)

Place of Birth	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %	Total No.	Total %
New York City and State	83	70	73	60	156	65
Puerto Rico	12	10	28	23	40	17
Other States	20	17	17	14	37	15
Foreign Country including West Indies	4	3	4	3	8	3
TOTAL	119	100	122	100	241	100

TABLE 21

Length of Residence in New York City of RYT Subjects (1964)

Years of Residence In New York	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %	Total No.	Total %
Entire Life	81	69	73	60	154	65
Less than One Year	1	.9	1	.8	2	.8
Two to Five Years	4	3	5	4	9	4
Six to Ten Years	10	9	11	9	21	9
More than Ten Years, but not Entire Life	21	18	31	26	52	22
TOTAL	117	99.9	121	99.8	238	100.8

TABLE 22

Ethnic Group Membership of RYT Subjects (1964)

Ethnic Group	Experimental		Control		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
White	47	39	48	39	95	39
Negro	53	44	41	33	94	39
Puerto Rican	19	16	35	28	54	22
Chinese	1	.8	0	0	1	.4
TOTAL	120	99.8	124	100	244	100.4

TABLE 23

Religious Affiliation of RYT Subjects (1964)

Religious Group	Experimental		Control		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Protestant	46	39	37	32	83	36
Catholic	67	57	77	68	144	62
Jewish	2	2	0	0	2	.9
Black Muslim	2	2	0	0	2	.9
TOTAL	117	100	114	100	231	99.8

TABLE 24

Home Living Arrangements of RYT Subjects (1964)

Home Living Arrangements	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %	Total No.	Total %
Living Alone	3	3	6	5	9	4
With Two Parents, Natural or one Natural, one Surrogate	58	50	59	49	117	49
With one Parent Alone	37	32	31	26	68	29
With Relative as Head of Household	10	9	13	11	23	10
With Own Wife or Girlfriend	3	3	7	6	10	4
With Male Friend, Guardian, Social Agency, Other	5	4	5	4	10	4
TOTAL	116	101	121	101	237	100

TABLE 25

Occupations of Fathers of RYT Subjects (1964)

Occupations of Fathers	Experimental		Control		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Laborer	25	21	15	12	40	17
Operator, Crafts	22	19	15	12	37	15
Service, Household Work	21	18	27	22	48	20
Clerical, Sales	5	4	5	4	10	4
Manager	1	.9	1	.8	2	.8
Technical	4	3	13	11	17	7
Unemployed, Invalid	6	5	10	8	16	7
Other, Not Stated	33	28	36	30	69	29
TOTAL	117	98.9	122	99.8	239	99.8

TABLE 26

Classification of Occupations of Fathers of RYT Subjects (1964)

Classification	Experimental		Control		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Blue Collar	57	65	48	56	105	61
White Collar	6	7	11	13	17	10
Services	24	28	26	31	50	29
TOTAL	87	100	85	100	172	100

TABLE 27

Classification of Occupations of Mothers of RYT Subjects (1964)

Classification	Experimental		Control		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Not Employed	64	60	66	58	130	59
Blue Collar	16	15	20	18	36	16
White Collar	9	8	5	4	14	6
Services	18	17	23	20	41	19
TOTAL	107	100	114	100	221	100

TABLE 28

Highest Grade of School Completed by RYT Subjects (1964)

School Grade Completed	Experimental		Control		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One-Six	1	.8	3	2	4	2
Seven-Nine	37	31	41	33	78	32
Ten-Twelve	81	67	80	65	161	66
Thirteen-Sixteen	1	.8	0	0	1	.4
TOTAL	120	99.6	124	100	244	100.4

TABLE 29

Type of High School Attended
by RYT Subjects (1964)

Type of High School	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %	Total No.	Total %
Academic	47	39	27	22	74	30
Commercial	8	7	8	6	16	7
Vocational	27	22	49	40	76	31
Not Stated	39	32	40	32	79	32
TOTAL	121	100	124	100	245	100

TABLE 30

Present School Status
of RYT Subjects (1964)

Present School Status	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %	Total No.	Total %
Still Attending	1	.9	0	0	1	.4
Dropout	116	99	116	100	232	100
TOTAL	117	99.9	116	100	233	100.4

TABLE 31

Occupation Held by RYT Subjects Immediately Prior to Incarceration

Occupation	Experimental No.	 %	Control No.	 %	Total No.	 %
Laborer	31	26	26	21	57	24
Operator, Crafts	7	6	14	11	21	9
Services, Household Work	32	27	22	18	54	22
Clerical, Sales	18	15	24	20	42	17
Manager	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technical	1	.8	8	7	9	4
Unemployed	19	16	18	15	37	15
Other, Not Stated	11	9	10	8	21	9
TOTAL	119	99.8	122	100	241	100

TABLE 32

Classification of Occupation Held by RYT Subjects Immediately Prior to Incarceration

	Experimental No.	 %	Control No.	 %	Total No.	 %
Blue Collar	47	45	65	57	112	51
White Collar	23	22	19	17	42	19
Services	34	33	30	26	64	29
TOTAL	104	100	114	100	218	99

TABLE 33

Longest Duration of Employment
Prior to Incarceration
Reported by RYT Subjects (1964)

Duration of Position	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Less than One Month	25	21	25	20
1-5 Months	41	35	55	45
6-12 Months	21	18	17	14
1-10 Years	9	8	12	10
Not Stated, Not Applicable	22	19	13	11
TOTAL	118	101	122	100

TABLE 34

Comparison of Earnings at Last Employment
Prior to Incarceration (1964)

Earnings Per Week	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
$40 or Less	19	21	10	10
$41-$60 per Week	43	47	50	50
$61-$80 per Week	23	25	29	29
$81-$100 per Week	6	7	6	6
$100 per Week or More	0	0	5	5
TOTAL	91	100	100	100

Criminal History

The delinquent and criminal history of the two groups is comparable in all essentials. (Tables 35, 36, 37) Aside from the fact that these tables demonstrate that background characteristics shared by experimentals and controls are sufficiently alike so that research variables can be tested, the thing to be observed is the extensity of the prior delinquent history. Both experimental and control groups had extensive histories of delinquency as juveniles. 47.9% of the RYT sample had appeared in Family Court. 59.2% had at least one adjudication as a Youthful Offender and 27.9% of the combined RYT sample had experience with the Juvenile Aid Bureau. These youths are not newcomers to police, court and correctional services. On the average they have spent fifteen months in confinement in some sort of juvenile institution prior to the arrest which led to their incarceration at Rikers Island. A majority also have been under probation supervision for extended periods of time.

Tables 38, 39 and 40 give further evidence that these youths are not newcomers to crime and delinquency. For only one experimental subject and one control subject was this the first arrest. (Table 40) 15.9% of the sample had at least one previous arrest, 57.14% had two or three prior arrests, and 26% had four or more prior arrests. These figures show that a large number of RYT subjects were identified as lawbreakers at an earlier period. They have spent extended periods in juvenile institutions and in programs intended to prevent further delinquency. Subsequently they have committed multiple misdemeanors and felonies, which resulted in arrest, prosecution, and commitment to jail as adults in a criminal court. An overwhelming majority are repeaters. They have been convicted of a wide variety of crimes. In terms of the offense categories listed, and their implication for society, the RYT subjects are representative of a serious problem for society at large.

Offenses

Most of the offenses for which RYT subjects were committed to Rikers Island are distributed equally in the two groups. There are minor differences. The experimental group is indicated to have a larger number of burglars; 35 experimental subjects were convicted of burglary, only 19 controls were convicted of this offense. The control group has a larger number convicted for possession and/or sale of drugs. In the experimental group 5 men were convicted of drug sale, use, or possession. In the control group 10 men were convicted of similar offenses. All other offense categories are approximately equal. Statistical significance of differences are very small in every instance. It was on the basis of such findings that the original decision was made not to stratify for offense. However, subsequent analysis of data, particularly analysis of social case histories obtained in the follow-up study, indicate that it probably would be wiser to develop offense categories using case history as a criterion rather than convicted offense.

Many uncontrolled factors, such as trading a guilty plea in return for a less serious charge by the prosecuting attorney, make convicted offense unreliable for most research purposes.

Parole "marks" as a measure of seriousness of offense history

Table 42 provides some additional interpretive material for assessing the degree of similarity between the control and experimental groups with regard to seriousness of criminal history and offense. For inmates who are under indefinite sentence, the Parole Commission has developed a system for deciding when a young offender should be considered for Parole. After talking with the inmate and reviewing his record the Parole Commission assigns a certain number of "marks", roughly corresponding to the number of months that he might be expected to remain in jail. The inmate can "erase" some of these marks by "good-time" (i.e.) by appropriate conforming behavior in jail and so may reduce the number of months he spends in confinement. The number of marks assigned at the outset can be taken as an index of the seriousness of the offense history as rated by the Parole Commission. Marks given inmates at Rikers range from approximately three to thirty-six months, with a mean of 12-14 months. As may be observed from Table 42, there is no significant difference between control and experimental groups on this measure.

Educational Background

Although parents and relatives of both experimental and control groups have less formal education than their boys, parents of the control group have somewhat less education than do parents of the experimental group. Approximately 40% of the parents and relatives of the experimental group and 60% of the parents and relatives of the control group have educational levels of ninth grade or less. (Appendix B-16)However, the educational level attained by parents and relatives shows no statistical relationship to the educational level attained by the boys.

Almost all experimental and control subjects are school dropouts (See Table 30). Only one experimental subject and none of the controls were still in school at time of arrest. When they last attended school, however, a larger percentage (38.8%) of the experimental group had been following academic high school curricula (Table 2[illegible]) as compared to 21.7% of the controls. Conversely, 39.5% of the controls had been in vocational high schools as compared with 22.3% of the experimental subjects. This difference in the type of high school attended is significant at the .025 level.

Differences in Birthplace of Parent or Relative

There are significant differences (p = .05) with regard to place of birth of the parent or relative. (See Table 43) A larger number of the parents or relatives of experimental subjects were born in the Southern States. (36.9% experimental and 23.08% control). In the control group more parents and relatives are of Puerto Rican extraction. (27.4% controls as contrasted with 8.3% experimentals). However, there is no evidence in our data to suggest that these differences in place of birth of parent or relative had a systematic influence on experimental or control subjects with regard to major research variables. That is, there is no statistically significant relationship between birthplace of parent and subsequent return to jail on the part of the boy.

Comparison of Pre-training Scores on Objective Tests

Finally, there were no significant differences to be noted when RYT experimental subjects were compared with RYT control subjects on objective tests administered before training began. The mean and standard deviations of experimental and control scores for IBM aptitude, Gates Reading Grade Level, and Gates Speed of Reading, Vocabulary and Comprehension and Beta IQ scores, are reported in Table 44.

[illegible] break up

TABLE 35

RYT Subjects with a Family Court Record (1964)

Family Court Record	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %	Total No.	Total %
Yes	56	47	60	49	116	48
No	64	53	62	51	126	52
TOTAL	120	100	122	100	242	100

TABLE 36

RYT Subjects with Youthful Offender Record (1964)

Youthful Offender Record	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %	Total No.	Total %
Yes	77	64	67	54	144	59
No	43	36	56	45	99	41
TOTAL	120	100	123	99	243	100

TABLE 37

RYT Subjects with Juvenile Aid Record (1964)

Juvenile Aid Record	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %	Total No.	Total %
Yes	34	28	34	28	68	28
No	86	72	89	72	175	72
TOTAL	120	100	123	100	243	100

Misdemeanors from Age 16
for RYT Subjects (1964)

Number of Misdemeanors Charged	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %	Total No.	Total %
None	20	17	26	22	46	20
One	35	30	30	25	65	28
Two	31	27	28	23	59	25
Three	17	15	18	15	35	15
Four or More	13	11	17	14	30	13
TOTAL	116	100	119	99	235	101

TABLE 39
Felonies from Age 16
for RYT Subjects (1964)

Number of Felonies Charged	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %	Total No.	Total %
None	28	24	33	27	61	26
One	41	35	41	34	82	35
Two	29	25	25	21	54	23
Three	16	14	16	13	32	13
Four or More	3	3	5	4	8	3
TOTAL	117	101	120	99	237	100

TABLE 40

Arrest Record for RYT Subjects
From Age 16 (1964)

Arrest Record	Experimental		Control		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
None	1	.9	1	.8	2	.8
One	19	16	19	16	38	16
Two-Three	74	63	62	52	136	57
Four-Five	23	19	30	25	53	22
Six or More	1	.9	8	7	9	4
TOTAL	118	99.8	120	100.8	238	99.8

TABLE 41

Comparison of Offenses Leading to Incarceration of Experimental and Control Subjects (1964)

Offenses	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Mal. Mischief, Wayward Minor, Youthful Offender	5	4	4	4
Assault, Carnal Abuse, Murder, Homocide, Manslaughter, Rape	22	19	19	18
Robbery	4	3	6	6
Burglar's tools, Burglary, Unlawful Entry	35	30	19	18
Forgery, Grand Larceny, Receiving Stolen Property	33	29	31	29
Petit Larceny	7	6	10	9
Drugs (Incl.sale & possession)	5	4	10	9
Arson, Dangerous Weapon, Resisting or Interferring with Arrest	1	.9	9	8
Non-Support, Violation of Probation, Unlawful Assembly	3	3	0	0
TOTAL	115	98.9	108	101

Comparison of Marks Given During Incarceration for Experimental and Control Subjects (1964)

Marks Given	Experimental		Control		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3-5	7	6	3	3	10	5
6-8	10	9	11	11	21	10
9-11	18	16	22	22	40	19
12-14	33	29	30	29	63	29
15-17	28	25	19	19	47	22
18-20	12	11	8	8	20	9
21-36	4	4	9	9	13	6
TOTAL	112	100	102	101	214	100

TABLE 43

Birthplace of Relative Responsible for RYT Subject (1964)

Place of Birth	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Northeast States, incl. NYC	37	44	38	42
Southern States	31	37	21	23
Puerto Rico	7	8	25	27
Europe, West Indies	6	7	6	7
U.S. (Other than Northeast and South), Other	3	4	1	1
TOTAL	84	100	91	100

---

p=.05
df=4

TABLE 44

Comparison of RYT Experimental and Control Subjects

Before Training on Objective Tests (1964)

	Experimentals		Controls		Significance
Objective Tests	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
IBM Aptitude	21.8	5.7	22.8	6.8	Not Significant
Gates Reading Grade Level	8.8	19.2	8.5	19.2	Not Significant
Gates Speed of Reading	23.7	7.9	22.3	7.6	Not Significant
Gates Vocabulary	41.7	11.1	40.6	11.0	Not Significant
Gates Comprehension	30.9	6.7	31.2	6.6	Not Significant
Beta I.Q.	103.3	9.3	103.7	9.2	Not Significant

The Reduction of Recidivism in RYT

A comparison of RYT subjects who committed new crimes for which they were returned to jail or sentenced to state or federal prisons reveals that half (52%) of the experimentals stayed out of jail and/or prison, while only one-third (34%) of the controls stayed out of such institutions during the first year after release. This finding, which is statistically significant at a .01 level, indicates that RYT was effective in reducing recidivism. (Table 45) This 18 percent difference between experimentals and controls is most impressive considering the previous records of crime and recidivism in these two groups, the complexity and massive character of the problem being challenged and the limitations and operational difficulties of the project itself. Consider that a 20 week training program supported by an irregular and faltering placement and aftercare program had to overcome the effects of social and economic disadvantage and discrimination, family and neighborhood disorganization and extended personal histories of school failure, juvenile delinquency and crime. Without help, two out of the three selected control group were returned to jail.

TABLE 45

RYT Subjects Returned to Jail or Prison Within 12 Months After Release from New York City Reformatory on Rikers Island

Returned to Jail or Prison	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	54	48	73	66
No	58	52	37	34
TOTAL	112	100	110	100

p=.01
df= 1

Some of the study group were released in January 1964 and were in the community for almost 3 years at the time of follow up. The majority had been released two to three years. At least one year had elapsed between release and follow up for all subjects. The last man released, an experimental group subject, was released in January 1966. The shortest length of time between release and reincarceration was one week; 11 men were back in jail within three months. Another group of 37 stayed out of jail or prison for a period of four to nine months before committing crimes that resulted in reincarceration. An additional 43 kept their freedom for ten to fifteen months, 20 more returned after 16-21 months, and finally, 8 others returned after 22-24 months of freedom. More than half (119) of the total RYT sample were back in jail or prison within two years of their release from Rikers Island. Out of these 119 for whom elapsed time records were available, 9% returned in three months, 40% in nine months, 76% in fifteen months, 92% in twenty-one months, and 98% in twenty-four months.

The Reduction of Recidivism Among Drug Users

The RYT follow up study was able to obtain verified data from official records on 222 out of a total possible 240 cases. The 18 missing cases were definite sentence cases in which there was no legal basis for review or follow up by official agencies after the person had been released from jail.

Of the total 222 verified cases, 79 were identified as drug users; 29 of these were in the experimental group and 50 were in the control group.

In most of these cases the legal basis for commitment to Rikers Island at the time of the study was not because of a conviction on a drug charge. In follow up interviews, however, several of the boys revealed that their thefts often were related to the need to obtain money to buy drugs.

TABLE 46

History of Drug Use Reported by RYT Subjects

and Type of Drug Used (1964)

History of Drug Use	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
No History	89	74	61	50
Heroin, Morphine, Cocaine	16	13	46	38
Marijuana	8	7	6	5
Barbiturates, Bromides	5	4	5	4
Demoral, Methadone, Benzadrine, Amphetamine, Peyote, L.S.D.	2	2	3	2
TOTAL	120*	101	121*	99

---

p=.001
df=4

*Totals include users reporting extensive use of more than one drug.

Thus, while only 4 percent of the experimental group and only 9 percent of the control group actually had been convicted of sale, possession or use of drugs, (Table 46) social case history information revealed that approximately 26% of the experimental group had used drugs and that 49% of the control group had a similar prior history.
In addition, 13 percent of the experimental group had used Heroin, Morphine or Cocaine, compared with 38% of the control group. This serious difference in reported exper-

ience with drugs is significant at the .001 level. From the point of view of making valid comparisons between the experimental and control groups such differences must be kept in mind. They underline the danger of using convicted offense as a major criterion for selection of subject populations.

TABLE 47

Age at Which Drugs were First Used
Reported by RYT Subjects (1964)

Age at First Drug Use	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
0-15 Years	7	24	12	24
16-18 Years	11	38	28	56
19-20 Years	9	31	7	14
21 Years or More	1	3	0	0
Unknown	1	3	3	6
TOTAL	29	99	50	100

TABLE 48

Frequency with Which Drugs were
Used at Time of First Drug Use
as Reported by RYT Subjects (1964)

Frequency	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Irregular	6	20	9	18
Every Day	4	14	14	28
Unknown	19	65	27	54
TOTAL	29	99	50	100

TABLE 49

Frequency of Drug Use
Just Prior to Incarceration
Reported by RYT Subjects (1964)

Frequency	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Irregular	1	3	10	20
Every Day	9	31	30	60
Unknown	19	65	10	20
TOTAL	29	100	50	100

Most of the RYT Subjects who used drugs reported that they started after age 16. (Table 47) There is some evidence that the experimentals as a group are more recently and heavily addicted; a larger percentage of experimentals began using in the 19-21 age period. Tables 48 and 49 also clearly show the shift from irregular first use to regular every day use that might be expected in reporting on an addiction. However, interpretation of these latter tables must be cautious because of missing data and small numbers.

The fact that more addicts are in the control group might account for part of the differential rate of return to jail for experimentals and controls. Addicts have a high rate of recidivism and are more likely to be identified and arrested after committing a crime. However, separate analysis of recidivism of drug users and non-drug users indicates that the finding of reduced recidivism in the experimental group also holds for drug users. (Tables 50 & 51)

TABLE 50

Recidivism of RYT Experimental and Control Subjects Using Drugs (1966)

	Drug			
Return to Jail	Experimental No.	 %	Control No.	 %
Yes	16	55	40	80
No	13	45	10	20
TOTAL	29	100	50	100

TABLE 51

Recidivism of RYT Experimental and Control Subjects Non-Drug Users (1966)

Return to Jail	Experimental No.	 %	Control No.	 %
Yes	38	46	32	54
No	45	54	27	46
TOTAL	83	100	59	100

When experimentals and controls are compared with regard to recidivism and drug use, 80% of the drug users in the control group are found to be recidivists and have returned to jail. In contrast, only 55% of the drug users in the experimental group have returned to jail. Only 1 out of 5 drug users in the control group managed to stay out of jail; but 45%, or nearly 1 out of 2 drug users given RYT training and services maintained themselves in the community and did not return to jail during the period covered by the study. The difference between these proportions is significant at a .05 level of confidence. At the same time, the difference in recidivism between experimental non-drug users and control non-drug users is not statistically significant though in the same direction.

The overall implication of these findings is that the RYT program may have had the greatest effect on a sub-group in the experimental population who were least likely to succeed, (i.e.) the drug addict.

The Effect of RYT on Subjects from Different Educational Background

In the earlier analysis of randomization and distribution of subjects into control and experimental groups it was noted that a larger percentage of control group subjects had come from vocational-commercial high schools. (Table 29) Such high schools in New York City often are used as "continuation" schools for persons having difficulty in academic high schools. They also tend to receive a disproportionate number of the socially maladjusted management problems from other schools. As with the drug users, such an over representation of what might be problem cases could increase the possibility of finding more recidivism in the control group. However, this possible contingency is not supported by the results of an analysis of recidivism and high school background. Instead, the data tend to suggest that RYT training has somewhat greater impact on these boys. (Tables 52 & 53) This, again, tends to suggest that RYT was more effective with those boys with the greatest handicaps.

TABLE 52

Recidivism of RYT Experimental and Control Subjects Coming with Vocational High School Background (1966)

	Vocational			
Return to Jail	Experimental No.	%	Control No.	%
Yes	11	37	33	66
No	19	63	17	34
TOTAL	30	100	50	100

TABLE 53

Recidivism of RYT Experimental and Control Subjects with Academic High School Background (1966)

Return to Jail	Academic Experimental No.	Academic Experimental %	Academic Control No.	Academic Control %
Yes	24	55	16	70
No	20	45	7	30
TOTAL	44	100	23	100

The Effect of RYT on Return to Jail as Measured by Changes in Predicted Outcomes:

In order further to test the implication that RYT might have an effect on the "worst" segment of the experimental group and a less effect on "better" candidates, multiple regression coefficients using return to jail as a dependent variable were computed for 16 categories of pre-training demographic information. Six of these categories correlated well enough with the dependent variable to have predictive value. These correlations are shown in Table 54.

TABLE 54

Multiple Correlations Between

Recidivism and Six RYT Demographic Variables

Independent Variables	Experimental	Control
Years of Residence in New York	.55	.67
Highest Grade Achieved	.74	.82
Number of Days Spent in Commitments From Family Court	.49	.62
Number of Days Spent in Commitments as a Youthful Offender	.70	.79
Number of Arrests Since Age 16	.19	.14
Number of Marks Assigned by Parole Commission	.44	.37

Beta weights were computed for each of these categories and a single weighted score was derived for each subject in the sample. Experimental and control groups were separated and ranked from lowest predicted recidivism score to highest predicted recidivism score. The upper 50 percent of experimentals were compared with the upper 50 percent of controls. The lower 50 percent of each group was compared with the lower 50 percent of the other group. The results tend to support the hypothesis that RYT was most effective with subjects having the greatest potential for recidivism. When they are compared on actual return to jail significant differences appear in the numbers of experimentals and controls with predicted high recidivism scores. Two-thirds of the RYT trainees having a background and social history which is most highly correlated with recidivism do not commit further crimes and do not return to jail after RYT. On the other hand, 55 percent of the controls with similar predisposing background and social history do commit further crimes and return to jail. (Table 55). Finally, there is no significant difference in actual return to jail between experimentals and controls with predicted low recidivism scores. (Table 56)

TABLE 55

Comparison of Actual & Predicted
Recidivism of RYT subjects With High Predicted
Recidivism Scores

Actual Recidivism

Predicted High Recidivism	Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%
Upper 50% of Experimental Group	20	33	40	66
Upper 50% of Control Group	34	55	28	45
TOTALS	54		68	

$X^2 = 4.8775$
$p = >.05$

TABLE 56

Comparison of Actual & Predicted Recidivism of RYT Subjects With Low Predicted Recidivism Scores

Actual Recidivism

Predicted Low Recidivism	Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%
Lower 50% of Experimental Group	33	55	27	45
Lower 50% of Control Group	41	66	21	33
TOTALS	74		48	

$X^2 = 1.1505$

$p = > 7.9$

This finding may be accounted for by the fact that for subjects with a low risk of recidivism a training program has a smaller range of opportunity to demonstrate an impact. It is only when subjects have high potential recidivism scores that an impact can be shown clearly. It is harder to demonstrate improvement when the differences between improvement and current status are small.

Nevertheless, this evidence, taken in conjunction with the finding of improvement in experimental group drug addicts and subjects with vocational high school background tends to confirm the position that the experimental program was most effective with those subjects with the "worst" histories.

The program was not able to move all boys into middle class jobs. However, the jobs that were obtained were far superior to those generally obtainable by the lowest segment of the group. This "break" may have been a significant factor for them. The sub-groups making up this lowest segment are those for whom few vocational services are available. Drug addicts and persons with serious and extensive criminal records have few places to turn for an opportunity to work, even in dead-end jobs.

The Effectiveness of RYT in Developing New Opportunities in the World of Work

One of the major questions posed by the project was concerned with whether trainees could be placed in jobs where they would have a chance to use IBM skills once they had been learned. An analysis of work opportunities available in the companies that hired experimental and control subjects indicates that RYT was successful in developing entrys into the world of work which were not available to control subjects. (See Table 57). Seventy-one percent of the experimentals worked in companies using automated data processing techniques as contrasted with 16 percent of the controls.

Twenty-six percent of the experimentals were in business where small electronic data processing departments were involved (small departments were defined as those having less than 10 employees engaged in data processing); 25% were in businesses in which 10 to 50 employees were engaged in data processing work and approximately 20% of the employers of

TABLE 57

The Number of Employees in Electronic Data Processing in Organizations Hiring RYT Subjects as Reported By Employers

NUMBER IN ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING	EXPERIMENTAL		CONTROL	
	No.	%	No.	%
Under 10	18	26	2	8
10 - 50	17	25	1	4
50 - 100	3	4	1	4
Over 100	11	16	0	0
None	19	28	22	85
TOTAL	68	99	26	101

$X^2 = 21.17$
$p = .001$

experimental cases had large electronic data processing divisions which engaged more than 50 employees.

These differences between the kinds of business in which experimental and control groups were employed is a direct result of the fact that RYT job developers tried to develop jobs in organizations where the IBM training of the experimental group would be applicable. However, despite the fact that there were electronic data processing activities available in the businesses where the boys were employed, only 28% of the experimental group actually were employed in work that was directly related to the IBM operations of the company. (Table 58).

TABLE 58

Employer Response to Question of Whether Work Trainee Was Hired to Perform was Related to IBM Operations in the Organization

	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	23	28	0	0
No	56	71	1	3
Not Applicable	1	2	36	97
TOTALS	80	101	37	100

$X^2 = 101.24$
$p = < .001$

TABLE 59

Employer Response to Question as to Whether Training Received in RYT was Relevant for Work He was Hired to Perform

	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Not Applicable	56	71	37	100
Hired for Work Indirectly Related to IBM	9	11	0	0
Hired for Work Specifically Related to IBM	15	18	0	0
TOTAL	80	100	37	100

$X^2 = 7.79$
$p = < .025$

In other words, many of the boys found jobs through contacts developed by RYT job developers, but were employed in tasks that did not use the machine training. In some cases, the employers felt that the level of training acquired by the trainees was still below that needed to enter into a full time working job in EDP. In these instances, however, RYT trainees usually were not regarded as much different than other trainees in the company at these entry-levels.

Although the boy was not considered immediately eligible for placement in the data processing unit, the job in which he was placed was regarded by the employer as a stepping stone into the data processing activities of the company. (See Table 59).

Further analysis of data from the employer interviews indicates that RYT training and job development often had a beneficial effect on job placement even when IBM placements were not made. Regardless of the actual requirements of a position or whether or not there was a potential for future utilization of IBM machine skills, 24% of the employers of trainees indicate that the fact that the boy had received training influenced their decision to hire. (Table 60). To a degree, the report of training helped offset feelings about hiring an ex-offender and school dropout. Furthermore, in 8% of the job placements, a special opening was developed specifically to give the trainee a chance. (Table 61). While this percentage is small, it contrasts dramatically with the 100% situation facing the control group; no special consideration was forthcoming for controls. They were hired only for existing job openings. (See Table 61). Ninety-one percent of the employers of control group subjects say that they hired the boys simply because they were short of help and the qualifications of the applicant were adequate for the job. In contrast, 56% of the experimental group subjects were hired primarily because of shortage of staff. (Table 62). Finally, 27% of the employers of experimental group subjects indicate that RYT job placement personnel stimulated a feeling of civic responsibility which motivated them to hire ex-offenders. Only 3% of the employers of control group members were so motivated.

TABLE 60

The Extent to Which RYT Training Influenced Hiring Decision as Reported by Employers

INFLUENCE OF TRAINING	EXPERIMENT		CONTROL	
	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	20	24	0	0
No	63	76	0	0
TOTAL	83	100	0	0

TABLE 61

Number of New Jobs Developed for RYT and Existing Job Openings as Reported by Employers

	EXPERIMENT		CONTROL	
	No.	%	No.	%
New Job Developed Specifically for RYT	7	8	0	0
Hired for Existing Job Opening	76	92	37	100
TOTAL	83	100	37	100

TABLE 62

Reasons for Hiring RYT Subjects as Reported by Employers

REASONS FOR HIRING	EXPERIMENT		CONTROL	
	No.	%	No.	%
Felt it was civic duty	22	27	1	3
Short of help, qualified applicant sold self, friend, relative	45	56	29	91
Combination, not known, other	14	17	2	6
TOTAL	81	100	32	100

The Effect of Training and Placement on Social Mobility

The kind of jobs obtained by RYT trainees fostered social mobility. Forty-eight percent of the experimental group were in white collar jobs. Only 18% of the controls were in white collar occupations.

TABLE 63

Job Classification of Entry Level Jobs for RYT Subjects as Reported by Employers

	EXPERIMENTAL		CONTROL	
	No.	%	No.	%
Blue collar	36	43	30	79
White collar	40	48	7	18
Service	7	8	1	3
TOTALS	83	99	38	100

$X^2 = 11.21$
$p = < .005$

There are also differences in the type of occupations held by experimental and control groups. Thirty-one percent of the experimental group are employed as laborers while 60% of the control group are laborers, 29% of the experimentals hold operator and technical type positions, which contrasts sharply with but 6% of the controls so employed. In part, this difference is directly related to the IBM training and placement received by the experimentals (See Table 64). The statistical significance of the differences in this table is nearly .025.

TABLE 64

Occupational Classification
of RYT Jobs Reported by Employers

OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION	EXPERIMENT No.	EXPERIMENT %	CONTROL No.	CONTROL %
Laborer	24	31	21	60
Operator, technician	22	29	2	6
Managerial, clerical	27	35	10	29
Other, Sales	4	5	2	6
TOTAL	77	100	35	101

Control boys are rated by their employers at the point of employment as being above average in qualification for entry jobs. This appears to be due to the fact that the jobs themselves are less demanding, and that the control group are a selected group. It will be remembered that all RYT subjects were screened from the general population of the institution

16

and were able to pass the IBM aptitude test and had at least an average score on an intelligence test. Since a large number of the general population in the jail were unable to pass the aptitude test and others scored too low on the IQ test to be included in RYT, it is probable that the control group was above average for the jobs sought. In contrast, after the first meeting with the RYT trainee, a number of employers indicated that they thought the young man was less able than the average candidate for the job. Thus, 14% of the employers anticipated that the boy might have some trouble with routine work because of educational deficiencies or lack of information. However, skill training, per se, was not at issue, a larger number of employers anticipated that the trainee would have more difficulties with the circumstances and conditions of work than with the skill requirements. (Table 66)

Thus, 13% expressed the idea that the trainee's attitudes and beliefs about work and his habits of work might create difficulties for him in the job. Nine percent of the employers were concerned that some difficulties with supervisors might occur and 6% anticipated that the particular trainee might have difficulty in getting along with fellow workers.

On the whole, it would appear that the entry-level skill provided by training was enough to open entry level jobs. Social training was still inadequate. Interviews with the employers of the experimental group indicated that 27% of the experimental subjects had skills which were higher than average for the job for which the trainee was hired. Seventeen percent of the group were rated as having average skill and 56% were rated as having lower than ordinary skills. (Table 65). Related to the importance of job placement is the fact that 56% of the experimental group were hired, regardless of being rated lower in skills than is usually required for the position. Similarly 50% were rated lower in education, 67% were lower in speech and 58% were lower in appearance than average and were still hired. In the case of the control group, the employers do not rate anyone as having lower skills or lower education. They do indicate that about 8% of the control population are rated lower in speech and 4% lower in appearance than is characteristic of persons occupying the position for which they were hired.

TABLE 65

Comparison by Employers of RYT

Subjects With Average Candidates for Jobs

Experimental Group Only

	HIGHER Than Average		SAME As Average		LOWER Than Average		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Skills	19	27	12	17	40	56	71	100
Education	12	18	22	32	34	50	68	100
Speech	14	21	8	12	44	67	66	100
Appearance	23	34	5	7	39	58	67	99

10

TABLE 65 (Cont'd.)

Control Group Only

	HIGHER Than Average		SAME As Average		LOWER Than Average		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Skills	20	83	4	17	0	0	24	100
Education	17	81	4	19	0	0	21	100
Speech	14	61	7	30	2	9	23	100
Appearance	14	58	9	37	1	4	24	99

These ratings by the employers are correlated with their evaluation of the kind of jobs for which the subjects were hired. Thus, when employers describe the normal entry requirements for jobs of the experimental and control groups further differences appear. The job requirements described by employers of experimental subjects clearly indicate that their entering level jobs required basic skills not required of the control subjects. (23% of the experimental subject jobs were rated as requiring basic skill as contrasted with only 3% of the control jobs. The significance of this difference is at a .025 level of confidence). Similarly, 32% of the experimental jobs are rated as requiring high school level education and only 18% of the control jobs are so rated. (Table (66).

With regard to physical ability, control group employers require more from their employees. In this instance, 22% of

(172)

the control group employers indicate that physical ability is an important factor and only 5% of the experimental group are concerned with physical ability. This difference is significant at a .025 level (actually the $x^2 = 6.27$). This difference is probably indicative of an emphasis in the control group on the necessity for a strong back in performing some of the labor requirements of the job.

A number of other lesser order differences are consistent with these observations with regard to the nature of the jobs obtained by experimentals and controls. Thus, there is a tendency to require an ability in the experimental group to meet and deal with the public (17% for the experimental group contrasted with 6% for the control group). There is also a tendency to require somewhat higher level of mechanical ability (19% for the experimental and 8% for the controls) and for a greater need for verbal ability (36% for the experimentals and 23% for the controls). In an overall evaluation of the data in this table, it is probably as instructive to note the negative responses as the positive responses. The general impression is that a comparison of control and experimental jobs reveals that the jobs of the experimental group are somewhat more demanding and seem to involve more social preparation, more education and higher level skills, and offer more potential for promotion. On the whole, however, for all the fact that they apparently have greater potential for growth and opportunity, they are still a fairly low level type of job when compared with the job market at large.

TABLE 66

Entering Requirements of
RYT Jobs as Reported by Employers

Requirements of Job	No.of Jobs Rated	Experiment		No.of Jobs Rated	Control		
		No.	%		No.	%	
Willingness to work	83	11	13	36	5	14	N.S.
Ambition & Initiative		2	2		1	3	N.S.
Basic skills at entry level		19	23		1	3	p= < .025
Responsibility & stability		4	5		3	8	N.S.
Get along with people		9	11		4	11	N.S.
High school level of education		27	32		7	18	p=.25
Mental alertness		17	20		10	27	N.S.
Good appearance		9	11		7	19	N.S.
Physical ability		4	5		8	22	p= <.025
Literacy		38	46		19	53	N.S.
Clerical		17	20		5	14	N.S.
Meet public		14	17		2	6	p=.25
Follow instructions		7	8		7	19	p=.25
Mechanical		16	19		3	8	p=.25
Arithmetic		18	22		6	17	N.S.
Verbal abilities		30	36		8	23	p=.25

Social and Environmental Problems

Most of the RYT population returned to live in the same neighborhood from which they had come before their incarceration. (Table 67). Nearly 84% of the total RYT sample returned to the exact neighborhood from which they had come to jail. Contrary to expectations many of them had lived in that neighborhood for an extended period of time. (See Table 68). Thus, 64% of the experimentals and 67% of the controls had lived in the same neighborhood for more than 5 years. However, 23% of the experimental group changed neighborhoods when they were released from Rikers. Only 9% of the control group changed. (These differences are significant at .01). There is some indication that these shifts were stimulated by involvement with the RYT program. This is an important area for intervention. Programs of rehabilitation begun in an institutional setting may be vitiated by return to the environment and situation which originally triggered delinquent behavior. Case workers often feel unable to do anything constructive about this problem. They do not have the means nor the facilities to help the client make a desired move. Frequently, recommendations to move are not acceptable to the client because they do not appear realistic nor is a social relationship available to help make a shift from friends, family, who live in the old neighborhood. In the case of some of the RYT trainees the necessity of moving to be closer to work was an acceptable rationale. However, if the work did not prove satisfying in a human relations sense, the boy was likely to terminate the job so he could move back to the social setting where he felt comfortable.

TABLE 67

Length of Residence at

Current Home Reported by RYT Subjects

	Experiment		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Less than 1 year, other	18	23	6	9
1 - 5 years	10	13	17	24
5 - 10 years	20	25	7	10
10 + years	31	39	40	57
TOTAL	79	100	70	100

TABLE 68

Number of Different

Residences in Past Five Years of

RYT Subjects - Reported by Relative or Parent

	Experimental		Control	
Number of Residences	No.	%	No.	%
One	41	48	50	56
Two	28	33	24	27
Three-Five	11	13	10	11
Six or More	5	6	6	7
TOTAL	85	100	90	101

Nature of the Job Market for Young Offenders

The large number of short term jobs held by young offender is not totally a matter of their own decision. Approximately

15% of the jobs obtained by both experimental and control groups were conceived by their employers as being only temporary at the time that they were hired. (See Table 69).

People examining the behavior of young offenders in the community are sometimes inclined to be extremely critical of their spotty work histories. These critics frequently take the attitude that it is totally the fault of the young offender. They fail to inform themselves of some of the realistic problems facing the young man with a prison record. First, even young adults entering the world of work without prison records frequently are forced to take temporary jobs or jobs promising little permanency until they have acquired some job experience. The young offender shares these common problems with other young adults. Second, a fairly large number of the jobs given young men on their release from prison are jobs in which employers expect a fairly high rate of turnover. For example, employers rate approximately 32% of the jobs held by young men in our sample as being jobs where they ordinarily would expect a *rapid* turnover; in 43% of the jobs they expected a *moderate* rate of turnover. Only in 25% of the jobs, was a *slow* turnover rate expected.

Further, employers indicate that 60% of the turnover in these jobs is due to the fact that the employee is dissatisfied with the pay or conditions of work and simply leaves the job. Twenty-one percent of the jobs have a built-in short term factor such as being seasonal. Only in 18.35% of the jobs is promotion within the company described as a major reason for turnover. (See Table 70).

TABLE 69

Rating by Employers of Jobs Held by RYT Subjects as to Permanency

Permanence of Employment	Experiment		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Permanent	71	85	32	84
Temporary	12	14	6	16
TOTAL	83	99	38	100

TABLE 70

Usual Reasons for Job Turnover in Jobs Held by RYT Subjects Reported by Employers

Reasons for Turnover	Experiment		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Leave Job	37	49	29	85
Promotion	19	25	1	3
Seasonal, other	19	25	4	12
TOTAL	75	99	34	100

TABLE 71

Qualifications for Logical Promotional Step for RYT Subjects as Reported by Employers

Qualifications	Experiment		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Education	20	45	2	18
Experience	23	52	9	82
Union Affiliation	1	2	0	0
TOTAL	44	99	11	100

A more detailed analysis of the reasons for turnover in the jobs held by the experimental and control groups after release from jail, reveals that 85% of the jobs held by control group members are jobs where there is usually a fairly high turnover rate because of dissatisfaction with payment and conditions of work. The number of young men locked into dead-end jobs was modified by RYT placement and development activities.

Only 3% of the control group held jobs which usually led to promotion to a better job within the company. This contrasts sharply with the factors contributing to turnover in the experimental group. Twenty-five percent of the jobs held by experimentals are jobs from which the employer regularly promotes his workers. (Table 70). The differences being described in this table are significant at the .005 level of confidence. These data and this level of significance reinforce the observation made earlier that many of the RYT experimental group were placed in jobs with greater future and more opportunity for promotion and development. Despite the fact that they were not immediately placed in jobs utilizing the specific training they had received, the jobs they held were better jobs.

The employers interviewed indicated that the jobs held by the experimental group were contingent jobs in many ways. (See Table 71). Not only did they hold a greater potential for promotion but they also held more certain possibility for termination if the young person did not measure up. Promotion from one of the jobs held by an experimental subject

177

frequently depended on getting further education and training. For example, we see in Table 71 that there is a difference between the experimental and control group with regard to the amount of educational qualification required for promotion to the next logical position. Thus, 45% of the experimental group jobs require some further training and education as contrasted with only 18% of the control group jobs requiring such additional education. Further, 82% of the control group jobs count the experience gathered in the job as the prime qualification for promotion to be considered. In the experimental group, however, only 52% of the employers regard experience as being the first factor to be considered in promotion.

Ethnic Identity and Promotional Opportunity

Employers of both experimental and control subjects indicate that there are logical promotional steps from the beginning jobs held by young men in the RYT sample. However, there were significant differences between ethnic groups with regard to promotional potential in jobs. Response from employers shows that 10% of the employed whites are in jobs where there is not a logical next promotional step in the same company, but 28% of the Negroes and 25% of the Puerto Ricans are in such dead-end jobs. (Table 72) The statistical significance of these differences is nearly at the .05 level.

Similar differences also exist between ethnic groups in jobs which do have promotional possibilities. Thus, 24% of jobs held by whites do not offer opportunity for promotion. However, 36% of the Negroes and 32% of the Puerto Rican population are in jobs indicated as not likely to qualify for promotion. (Table 73)

There was no evidence that these differences were due to discriminatory practices on the part of employers. Ethnicity is so linked with other variables such as education that a separate analysis of this issue could not be made. However, it is reasonable to suggest that in our sample, membership in an ethnic minority is part of a complex of variables relating to lower potential for promotion. However, there is some minimal indication that the RYT program was able to counteract the likelihood that a Puerto Rican or Negro would wind up in a dead-end job. The differences in promotional potential between jobs held by White, Negro and Puerto Ricans in the experimental group are smaller than between White, Negro and Puerto Ricans in the control group. When the total number of young men placed in jobs by RYT is subdivided into ethnic groups, the number in each category for which we have information about the promotional potential of the job is so small that it is unreasonable to undertake any statistical interpretation. A greater proportion of RYT-obtained jobs were more likely to be pathways to promotion, in comparison to self-obtained jobs. Training and transitional services, regardless of ethnic group membership, increase the likelihood that a young man may find a job with a potential future instead of a dead-end kind of job.

TABLE 72

Ethnic Group Membership of RYT Subjects and Employer Report of Chances for Promotion (1966)

Promotion	White		Negro		Puerto Rican	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes, through Civil Service	36	90	34	72	18	75
No	4	10	13	28	6	25
TOTAL	40	100	47	100	24	100

TABLE 73

Ethnic Group Membership of RYT Subjects and Employer Evaluations as to Whether Particular Subject was Qualified for Promotion to Next Logical Step (1966)

Qualifying	White		Negro		Puerto Rican	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes, possible	31	76	30	64	15	68
No, not applicable	10	24	17	36	7	32
TOTAL	41	100	47	100	22	100

Thirty-eight percent of the experimental group jobs are in companies which use psychological testing programs, while only 11% of the control group are in such companies. (Table 74) These differences also are significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 74

Formal Testing Programs in Companies Employing RYT Subjects Reported by Employer (1966)

Formal Testing Programs	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	30	38	4	11
No	50	63	32	89
TOTAL	80	101	36	100

---

p=.01

There is also a tendency (Table 75) for more of experimental group jobs to have a breaking-in period attached to them. Thus we see that 59% of the experimental jobs have a trial period as contrasted with 42% for the control group. However, (Table 76), there is a much more significant difference to be noted in the quality of supervision given the two groups during the early days of work. Fourteen percent of the control group are given no supervision at all. This is an indication of the small amount of responsibility and skill required. Only 2% of the experimental group are without supervision. Again, this would seem to give some indication as to the quality of the job held by each of the groups.

TABLE 75

Necessity for "Break-In" Period for Type of Job Held by RYT Subject - Reported by Employer (1966)

Break-In Period	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	48	59	15	42
No	33	41	21	58
TOTAL	81	100	36	100

TABLE 76

Type of Supervision for Jobs Held by RYT Subjects as Reported by Employers (1966)

Type of Supervision	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
General	41	50	20	55
Close	39	48	11	31
None at All	2	2	5	14
TOTAL	82	100	36	100

Some striking differences are highlighted by the comparison of experimental and control groups in terms of the kind and number of skills that can be learned while on the job. Thus (Table 77) 31% of the employers for the control group say that no general skills are likely to be learned on the job. This contrasts with only 11% of the experimental group employers who indicate that no general skills are likely to be learned as part of the job. However, the employers of experimental group subjects indicated that 89.2% of the experimental group can acquire mechanical, clerical, arithmetic, and verbal job skills while they are employed at the entry level job. The differences between the ratings of the experimental group employers and the control group employers is significant at a .025 level.

11

TABLE 77

Skills that May be Acquired on Job Held by RYT Subjects by Employers (1966)

Skills Acquired	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
None	9	11	11	31
Mechanical, clerical, arithmetic, crafts, formal, meet public, combination	73	89	25	69
TOTAL	82	100	36	100

Self-Confidence and its Effect on Recidivism

The response of the RYT population prior to release when questioned as to their chances of succeeding in the community following their release from Rikers Island are highly interesting. (Table 78) Of the young men who succeeded in maintaining themselves in jobs and who managed to stay out of jail, 89% were confident that on release they would be successful in avoiding a return to prison life. Only 11% of the group who were successful were dubious about their chances at the time of release. None of the successful group were completely pessimistic about their return to society. On the other hand, of the group who returned to prison only 60% were previously confident of success; 20% had been doubtful when they were released, and another 20% had been convinced that failure and return were inevitable.

It is interesting to note the differences in experimental and control groups as they respond to this same question. (Table 79) Seventy-five percent of the experimentals were confident of their success after release whereas only 57% of the control group felt such confidence. However, 16% of the experimentals and 17% of the controls felt that they would surely fail. (Tables 80, 81)

The Contribution of RYT to Self-Confidence

There is some evidence that (Tables 83 & 84) a more optimistic attitude was generated in the experimental group by the training and prospect of help on release. The boys in the experimental group report that the training caused them to feel increased self-confidence and assurance in tackling the outside community and the world of work. They also reported that the transitional services that were available contributed to their ability to handle some of the problems that arose.

In response to the specific question: "Did the RYT Training help you stay out of jail?" (Table 85), 71% of the trainees report that training contributed to remaining out of jail. Even though some trainees eventually were returned to jail, 39% of those who were returned indicated that they felt that the training had helped them stay out of jail longer. However, 21% of those who received training under the RYT program felt that it had been of no help to them. (Table 86) There was no difference in recidivism and non-recidivism of

177

this group who were pessimistic about the effects of training on their lives. (Table 84)

Both recidivist and non-recidivist trainees tend to rate the technical aspects of the vocational training program as being helpful. Similarly, both recidivist and non-recidivist agree that the learning of skills helped them to have confidence. (Table 86)

One of the proposed strategies of RYT was to develop a climate of hope and optimism that would counter the general pessimism of the jail and which would stimulate and strengthen motivation for learning and working. These findings tend to suggest that the program was at least partially successful in meeting this objective.

TABLE 78

Comparison of RYT Recidivist and Non-Recidivist Self-Ratings on the Likelihood of Remaining Out of Jail by RYT Subjects

Estimate of Success	Returned to Jail		Did Not Return to Jail	
	No.	%	No.	%
Would Succeed	30	60	17	89
Doubtful of Success	10	20	2	11
Would Not Succeed	10	20	0	0
TOTAL	50	100	19	100

TABLE 79

Comparison of RYT Experimental and Control Self-Ratings of the Likelihood of Remaining Out of Jail

Estimate	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Would Succeed	33	75	17	57
Doubtful of Success	4	9	8	27
Would Not Succeed	7	16	5	17
TOTAL	44	100	30	101

TABLE 80

Salaries Desired by RYT Experimental and Control Subjects

Salaries Desired	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Under $50 per week	1	1	0	0
$50-$75 per week	18	23	13	19
$75-$100 per week	25	32	21	30
$100 per week or More	33	43	36	51
TOTAL	77	99	70	100

TABLE 81

Chances of Getting a Good Job as Rated by RYT Experimental and Control Subjects

Estimate of Chances	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Bad	16	23	15	26
Poor	9	13	8	14
Fair	29	41	24	42
Very Good	8	11	8	14
Don't Know, Other	8	11	2	3
TOTAL	70	99	57	99

TABLE 82

Response of Experimental and Control Subjects to Question of What Preparations are Being Made by Subject to Get a Desirable Job

Preparations	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Nothing	40	51	37	51
Seeking Employment through Self, Parole, RYT	6	8	5	7
Plan to go to School, Now Attend School, Study on Own	22	28	16	22
Other	11	14	14	19
TOTAL	79	101	72	99

TABLE 83

Estimates by RYT Trainees of Chances of Securing Good Jobs Prior to RYT Training (1964)

Chances of Securing	Experimental Group only	
	No.	Percentage
Good	16	20
Fair	7	9
Uncertain	10	13
Poor	47	59
TOTAL	80	101

TABLE 84

Evaluation by Recidivist and Non-Recidivist Trainees as to Whether RYT Training Improved Chances of Getting a Better Job (1966)

Improved Chances	Experimental Group Only					
	Recidivist		Non-Recidivist		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	27	73	32	80	59	77
No	10	27	8	20	18	23
TOTAL	37	100	40	100	77	100

TABLE 85

Evaluation by Recidivist and Non-Recidivist Trainees as to Whether RYT Training Affected Chances of Staying Out of Jail (1966)

	Experimental Group					
	Recidivist		Non-Recidivist		Total	
Affected Chances	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	15	39	27	71	42	55
No	23	61	11	29	34	45
TOTAL	38	100	38	100	76	100

TABLE 86

Report of Trainees on Most Helpful Aspects of RYT As Reported (1966)

	Experimental Group					
	Recidivist		Non-Recidivist		Total	
How RYT Helped	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Not Helpful at all	6	22	6	21	12	21
In Vocational Training and Guidance	11	37	8	29	19	33
With Financial Aid	1	4	2	7	3	5
With Self-Confidence	8	26	10	36	18	32
Referral & Consultation with Other Agencies, Court & Parole	0	0	1	4	1	2
Other	3	11	1	4	4	7
TOTAL	29	100	28	100	57	100

Handicap of Prison Record

Greater numbers of the control group reported that they felt handicapped by their prison record. Eleven percent of the controls reported this as a major problem while only 5% of the experimentals reported it as a major problem. It may be that the intervention of the RYT job developers and placement personnel was effective in reducing the handicap apprehended by the experimental population. However, even though it is not reported as a major problem in the interviews with the young men in the experimental group, a frequent point of concern and discussion was the problem of whether or not to reveal to an employer that they had had a jail record. (Table 87)

TABLE 87

Difficulties Encountered by RYT Subjects in Looking for Work After Being in Jail-Reported by Parents and Relatives of Subjects(1966)

Difficulties	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
No Difficulty	62	74	59	69
Lack of Training, Education, Skills, Work Experience	5	6	6	7
Hindered by Outside Influences	4	5	2	2
Handicapped by Personal Characteristics	9	11	9	11
Prison Record	4	5	9	11
TOTAL	84	101	85	100

Job Placement

Some data was gathered regarding the type of companies and businesses that employed the young offenders in our sample.(Tables 88, 89 & 90) The young men worked almost equally for national and local concerns. Approximately as many were employed by large businesses as by smaller businesses. The slightly higher percentage of experimentals hired by larger companies seems to be related to the tendency of some of the larger companies to hire trainees for entry-level work which might lead to use of IBM training. Larger companies are not prone to hire ex-inmates because of security problems. This may account for the lower number of controls working in large companies.

The largest single area for employment of RYT subjects was in manufacturing. More of the control group were employed in manufacturing concerns than was true for the experimental group. Thus, 42% of the controls worked in manufacturing while only 29% of the experimentals worked in manufacturing. The next most frequent category of employment was hospital and service occupations. There was no appreciable difference between the experimental and control groups with regard to employment in hospital and service activities.

The 13% of the experimental group in the finance-real estate category is because data processing is a major activity for such organizations. However, the problems of bonding limited the final numbers placed in these organizations. (See later discussion)

TABLE 88

Type of Organization Hiring RYT Subjects as Reported by Employers (1966)

Type of Organization	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
National, International	35	43	18	47
Regional	2	2	1	3
State	4	5	2	5
Local	41	50	17	45
TOTAL	82	100	38	100

TABLE 89

Number of Employees in Organizations Hiring RYT Subjects - Reported by Employers (1966)

No. of Employees	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Under 100	31	41	22	61
100-499	14	18	9	25
500-999	8	11	1	3
1000 & over	23	30	4	11
TOTAL	76	100	36	100

TABLE 90

Type of Business Activity Hiring

RYT Subjects - Reported by Employers (1966)

Type of Organization	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Manufacturing	24	29	16	42
Wholesale & Retail Trade	11	13	4	10
Finance, Real Estate	11	13	3	8
Hospital - Services	22	27	9	24
Transportation	6	7	4	10
Civil Service	5	6	1	3
Other	4	5	1	3
TOTAL	83	100	38	100

How Did Employers Come to Contact the Boys They Hired?

Due to the fact that the job development and placement programs of RYT were slowed and halted before everyone in the experimental population had been released from jail, many RYT trainees were not available for placement by RYT job developers. The amount of staff time and budget required to develop jobs, to place clientele, to help them through the transitional crisis and to follow them in the community for research purposes, was also much larger than had been anticipated. Finally, some trainees rejected offers of help

TABLE 91

Sources of Referral for Employment of RYT Subjects as Reported by Employers (1966)

Source of Referral	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
RYT Job Developer	32	39	0	0
NYSES	5	6	3	8
Parole, Dept. of Correction	3	4	1	3
Prof. Employment Agency	9	11	2	5
Boy's Self, Friend	33	40	32	84
TOTAL	82	100	38	100

from RYT job developers.

Approximately 39% of the employers interviewed in the follow up study had been recruited by RYT staff and had boys placed in their organizations. (Table 91) Many of the employers who were interviewed had hired experimental group subjects but had no previous contact with RYT. Forty percent of the boys in the experimental group had found their own jobs. Employers of control group subjects indicated that, to the best of their knowledge, 84% of the boys they hired had no official help in coming to apply for work. A minority had been helped by agencies, the Parole Commission and Department of Correction. The experimental group also used private agencies in seeking employment to a larger degree than did the control group.

In order to find jobs, 34% of the controls returned to jobs or contacts established prior to their jail commitment. This utilization of previous relationships contrasts with an 18% figure for the experimental group. The implication is that the control subjects may have been pushed back to previous contacts and made to depend on environmental structures that could perpetuate delinquent patterns.

Job Stability and Employer Satisfaction

The data relating to job stability and employer satisfaction provide some highly pertinent information. While the actual numbers involved in some instances are relatively small, important and statistically significant differences do appear in the long term performance of experimental and control groups.

More than a year after release from Rikers Island, 20 experimental subjects are still working in companies where they originally were placed. Only 11 control subjects are still with their first employer. Thirteen out of the twenty experimentals are in the same job, not having been promoted or demoted. Eight controls are similarly in the same job at which they started. However, seven experimental subjects have been promoted in the meantime. Only three controls have been promoted.

Admittedly, these are very small numbers. Nevertheless, the fact that nearly 18% of the experimental group have been able to maintain themselves in the kind of jobs that were described in the preceding section, and that 9% of the experimentals have succeeded well enough to be promoted in an achievement which should not be minimized.

Further, and of major significance in this study, 12 of the 20 RYT trainees still employed by the same companies are involved in IBM machine operations or IBM related work. Nine of these are still at the same job level where they started, but three have been promoted. Significantly, all of these placements were made at a time when RYT supportive services were functioning most smoothly and were placements in companies which evidenced the greatest interest in the project throughout its life.

TABLE 92

A Comparison of RYT Experimental and Control Subjects and Job Stability (1966)

	Experimental							Control		
	Total E			IBM Related		Non-IBM				
	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	%	No.
Still with Same Company:	20	18	12			8		11	10	
still on same job			13		9		4			8
promoted			7		3		4			3
Working with different company	84	75		0		0		85	77	
Missing data	8	7		0		0		14	13	
Totals	112	100						110	100	

Data obtained is a composite of information from employers and follow up interviews with boys and relatives.

It would be foolish to suggest that successful vocational adjustment is necessarily tied to permanency with a single job or single employer. Simple persistence in a low level job might indicate failure as much as success, depending on personal capacities, opportunities, etc. Similarly, leaving a low status, dead-end job for a series of jobs with increasing potential may herald an improved adjustment. However, for the population leaving jail to enter the labor market, such stability as is indicated in the preceding paragraphs is unprecedented.

Ratings were also obtained for an additional 29 subjects no longer employed by the person making the ratings. All 29 of these young men left jobs on their own volition. Ten of these went to another job or on to school, etc; five left for personal reasons, family responsibilities, or illness; fourteen left without giving notice and the employer himself is unable to say exactly why the young man left. In a few cases, the boys left without giving notice because they had been arrested and were in jail. In a number of cases the boys left because conditions of work on the job became overly stressful for them personally or socially. (Tables B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4 of APPENDIX B)

Out of the 29 young men who left work on their own initiative, 19 were rated by the employers as being successful in their jobs at the time of their leaving. A number of employers were pleased by the RYT request for a follow up interview because they were interested in finding out what had happened to the young man. One or two expressed a desire to rehire the trainee if he wished to return.*

---

*In one such case the young man was rehired. He had failed to show up for work because of some personal family difficulties. He did not notify his employer nor did he try to explain what was happening. He did not feel secure enough in his relationship with his fellow workers or with his supervisor to risk going back after several days had elapsed. Instead, he found another job. When he met with his Parole Officer he rationalized his decision and pointed out that he was already on another job which he claimed to like very much. However, at the time of the follow up interview he was unemployed. In talking with the interviewer he explained the loss of the first job and expressed an interest in finding another job like the one that had been lost. It was possible to schedule an appointment with the employer. It was necessary to do more than just tell the boy about the appointment. It was necessary to go with him to the interview because of his anxiety and reluctance to face the employer he had abandoned.

20

Reference to Table B-1 shows that 30 (38%) of the experimental group were dismissed from jobs. Three were dismissed because of low skills; 3 were dismissed because of low education; 4 because of difficulty in working with others; 2 because of conflicts with their supervisors; 2 because they were suspected of theft or some delinquent activity on the job; and 15 were dismissed because of habitual lateness or absenteeism.

The factors which account for the largest single percentage of dismissals are associated with absenteeism and habitual lateness. Twenty-eight percent of all RYT subjects, both experimental and control, were unsatisfactory in their attendance at work. In addition, 18% of the total group were persistently tardy. This late adolescent group finds most of its satisfactions at night in interaction with other teenagers, and manages the release of tensions developed during the day, at such times. Lateness at work is the result of going to bed late. Six percent were also rated as unsatisfactory in their ability to manage the job requirements; 3% were rated as unsatisfactory in their personal appearance. There are no significant differences between experimentals and controls on these factors.

Some jobs were stressful and socially difficult from the trainee's point of view. This observation is supported by some observations made by employers. For example, 28%

(Table B-6) of the experimental group are rated by employers as not making friends among their fellow workers. The experimental group appeared to be more withdrawn and shy. This differentiates them from the control group since their employers indicated that these boys were able to make friends among their fellow workers. These ratings of inability to make friends are significant at nearly the .01 level. Some of these stresses and difficulties seem to be behind the boys to "drop out" of jobs. These ratings, by employers, taken in conjunction with the clinical data gathered in interviews with the boys confirm the idea that somewhat different personal work relationships and social class problems faced the experimental group boys. The young men in the control group were in jobs where class differences were small and habitual patterns of friendship were appropriate and interaction was easy. (B-6, B-7, B-8) On the other hand, the experimental group boys were often in jobs where social class issues and differences were involved. Their sense of being different on such bases as ethnic identity, and their lack of knowledge about the approved styles and trademarks of acceptable behavior in the work setting created problems for them. It is not that these boys are unwilling, it is rather that they don't know what dress, behavior and gestures will identify them as acceptable. Nor do they have knowledge of how to relate in a work setting where there are differentiated roles; where the individual must interact with others in terms of their roles at work rather than their interpersonal style. This created difficulties which were reflected in less adequate job performance, in absenteeism, and uncooperative patterns of behavior.

Earnings

The differences in salary between control and experimental groups are small. Appendix B-56 shows that more of the control group are found at the extremes of low and high pay. More of the experimental group are clustered in the middle range of salaries paid. The numbers involved at the extremes are fairly small. Thus, there are only 4 experimentals and 4 controls who are making better than $81 per week. One of the experimental subjects is making $160 per week. Three of the control subjects are making between $110 and $120 per week. Two of the control group are making less than $30 per week. Twenty-nine of the experimental group subjects or 37.66% are in the $61-$80 per week range. There are only seven or 18.92% of the control group subjects in this range. However, the data do not allow any conclusions.

Inmate Reasons for Entering the RYT Program

Sixty-nine percent of the total RYT population indicated that they participated in the project because they believed it might help them in getting a job. Thirty-two percent of the population entered the program to escape the boredom of jail routine. They participated in RYT merely as something more interesting than other alternatives that were available while they were incarcerated. Initial motivation for entering the RYT program did not relate to recidivism, however. (Table 93)

TABLE 93

Reason for Entering RYT Program

as Reported by Trainees (1966)

	Experimental Group Only					
	Recidivist		Non-Recidivist		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Wanted RYT, to escape jail routine	6	16	9	24	15	20
Wanted RYT; it would help prepare for job	27	73	24	63	51	68
Did not want RYT or was indifferent	4	11	5	13	9	12
TOTAL	37	100	38	100	75	100

Remedial Reading: Results & Test Scores

The remedial reading program given the experimental group was effective in the improvement of basic reading skills as measured by psychological test-retest scores.

As was noted in the earlier discussion of sample selection and randomization, the differences between Experimental and Control Beta IQ scores, IBM Aptitude scores, and Gates Test of Reading scores were negligible at the time the two groups were formed.

After the experimental group had completed the course of programmed reading instruction, however, several statistically significant changes appeared in the retests. Most of the experimental group were retested. However, since the activities of the control group were not subject to daily review by the research staff, a large number of control group subjects was released before they were retested. Thus the numbers for some control-experimental comparisons are very small. It may be assumed that the boys who were retested are representative of the whole.

Mean scores for each test-retest are presented in the following table:

TABLE 94

Mean Scores on Psychological Tests Before And After Training And Remedial Reading Instruction

Tests	Experimental Mean Scores				Control Mean Scores			
	Before		After		Before		After	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Beta IQ	119	103.3	30	108.0*	85	103.7	40	104.4
IBM Aptitude	119	21.7	88	24.9	96	22.7	26	23.5
Gates Reading Grade-level	119	8.7	81	9.1*	84	8.5	24	8.3*
Gates Speed of Reading	119	23.1	81	23.7**	84	22.3	24	19.4**
Gates Vocabulary	119	41.7	81	43.1	84	40.6	24	40.5
Gates Comprehension	119	30.9	81	33.8**	84	31.2	24	29.8

* Significant at .05
**Significant at .01

As can be seen from the table, the experimental group retest scores show improvement in every category. The retest scores of the control group are lower in every category except the Beta. There is general improvement in the experimental group and deterioration in the controls.

Retest differences between the groups are also statistically significant. Reading grade level, comprehension, and speed of reading all show the experimental group improving while controls remain the same or deteriorate slightly.

Obviously the remedial reading education program had an important positive effect on the test performance of the experimental group. However in view of the fact that the control group's vocabulary scores remained at the same level it may also be that the intervening institutional experience had a depressing effect on aspects of their life which are involved in the tests. The Vocabulary section of the Gates tests is the only part of the reading retest in which there is no initial significant difference between the groups. In other studies restricted stimulation and boredom have been shown to have a deleterious effect on reading skills.

CONTINUING BENEFITS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Citizens Advisory Committee

One of the most important outcomes of RYT was the development of an ad hoc Citizens Advisory Committee composed of local union and industry senior executives. This group began as an attempt to involve business and union leaders in finding and developing jobs for RYT trainees. Subsequently, as both staff and Committee gained experience, the Committee began to plan for aspects of pre-release training as well as post-release programming wider than job development and placement. They tried to increase acceptance of the RYT principle and access to support in the community.

The initial design had not anticipated the need for such a committee largely because RYT training was directed toward a single work role. Access to single work roles is usually controlled either by employers or by the Unions. Recognizing this, it is possible to design a single-target training program which relates to one or the other of these gatekeepers. However, if more than one work role is the target, it is likely that negotiations for jobs will have to involve both groups. In RYT it seemed, at the outset, that gaining access to jobs using IBM skills seemed to be mostly a matter of establishing agreements with specific employers who would cooperate.

Before the project began, a sufficient number of employers had indicated an interest so that it seemed feasible to start.

The expectation was that it would not be too difficult to locate other employers as the project moved along. These early expectations were not realized, however. Almost immediately, RYT was frustrated in gaining access to needed work roles. Some of the organizations and businesses that had expressed interest, were not at all interested when faced with real live ex-inmates. Many offered logical reasons why they couldn't keep their early promises: they were shifting from punch-card processing to electronic systems, they were moving their major installations, etc. Moreover, as other employers were contacted, it became increasingly clear that traditional economic concerns and hiring restrictions were not going to be modified greatly by humanitarian and scientific appeals, even if part of the scientific rationale was that economic gains to employers and community would be demonstrated. It was obvious that unless a different kind of leverage was developed, most of the RYT trainees would not be placed in jobs where their training would be used directly. It was necessary to develop more powerful approaches to the employment structure of the city and to use the training experience as a rationale to gain access to a more general range of entry-level jobs which eventually might lead into data-processing jobs. But, while it was possible to deal with specific employers when training boys for single target work roles, it was necessary to deal with a much larger sector of the community when the task was reconceptualized in these broader terms. The gate-keepers to these more general entry-level work roles were the various unions and trade associations. Information was needed about these groups, their interrelationships and the factors influencing access to work roles. It was immediately apparent that RYT was entering an extremely complicated social structure in the City. Gathering such information and developing the necessary relationships required a special competence and knowledge that was beyond the experience and capacity of the small RYT staff. Hence, the need for the Committee.

The development of the Citizens Advisory Committee was a time consuming and at times a disheartening task for the staff involved. Many discouraging rejections were encountered. Finding the group was largely a trial and error process of trying to locate leaders who were willing to lend themselves to opening work roles for the special group represented by RYT. Further, it was necessary to avoid taking sides in various internecine struggles between groups. However, the leaders who volunteered to participate were a significant and rewarding group. They became the source for discovering and interesting others in membership on the Committee.

Because union and industry leaders obviously were partisan they could not reach the larger audience necessary to provide total community support for the project nor could they develop the kind of public interest that would influence elected public officials. The Committee needed to buttress its membership with individuals who were identified with the general public good -

in this case representatives of public communications media, who would be able to describe the nature and value of activities that were going on to a widespread audience. These new members formed the core of a sub-committee on public relations which undertook the task of shifting public attitudes toward the employment and social restoration of youthful offenders.

Various tactics were tried. A series of editorials were written in the Saturday Review of Literature by one of the members of the Committee; newspaper articles were developed and distributed at critical points in the life of the project; and contacts were developed which led to an NBC-TV production of an hour-long, two-part documentary film entitled "The Road Back". This film has been borrowed by several groups in corrections and education and has been widely shown. Most recently, it has been shown at state teachers' conventions in 7 different states.

While the problems of developing an informed public have not been solved in New York, a number of avenues for changing community attitudes were opened and continue to be active and concerned about the problems illustrated by RYT even though the project itself has been completed.

In its early days, the staff tended to use this Advisory Committee as a collection of individuals to whom they might turn as a source of moral support, encouragement and influence. It quickly became clear that the members of the Advisory Committee wished to participate more directly in the program and to be involved in making decisions. The Advisory Committee saw itself as contributing not only influence, but experience in the world of work. Further, each member had his own image of what the work community in New York ought to be and his own concept about what should be happening to achieve it. Unfortunately, the RYT staff did not have the time to do the staff work which would bring these various viewpoints into focus and to develop the concensus which would have provided a unified committee thrust into the community. Instead they continued to deal with the Committee as individuals. What RYT staff wanted most was jobs and the members of the Committee were effective channels for better jobs than could have been obtained without their activity and influence. In retrospect, it seems likely that they might have been more effective if the value orientations each individual was using in developing relationships and in opening opportunities could have been reviewed and sharpened by the group acting together. Although the staff was aware of this larger potential in the Committee, they were never able to disentangle themselves from the immediate pressures of finding jobs and getting boys in them to take advantage of it. It remained for a subsequent project to inherit this opportunity, to profit from RYT's experience and to reap the benefits of a more unified interaction.

One final comment about staff and Committee interaction is germane for anyone planning to involve union and business leaders in creating jobs. The members of the RYT Citizens Advisory Committee were truly policy makers. RYT had reached for them because they were influential, with the belief that they would be able to provide access to jobs. But, for that purpose, they had reached too high. Advisory Committee members were not people who participated in development activities. They opened doors, but frequently job development and eventually placement had to be developed independently.

In future projects, the Citizens Advisory Committee is seen as participating with vocational educators to design up-to-date curricula and to stimulate methods of teaching which are relevant to current situations in the world of work. To be successful in training handicapped people for entrance into modern industry and business, an up-to-date and continuing dialogue must exist between those who train and those who control job entry. Otherwise training will not be current and useful. A "responsive" pattern of vocational education is needed - a pattern in which education is sensitive to changes in the labor market and "responds" by maintaining an appropriately up-to-date program. Vocational education programs in correctional institutions often teach outmoded operations on obsolete equipment and with standards of accomplishment that are out of phase with what union and industry leaders think is practical for entrance to the real world of work. Union and industry leaders often are more concerned with interest and commitment to an area of work than in a wide array of skills and special training for tasks which lie above the entry-level positions for which most new workers can be hired. Based on the RYT experience it appears that training for young adults in jail might be divided advantageously into two phases. The first, would be in-jail diagnostic study and preparation for entry-level jobs or work opportunities where on-the-job training would follow. The second phase would be built on the recognition that successful growth within the job will require further training, support and guidance. This phase would aim at the gradual development of specific skills and new social perspectives, meshing both with an actual work situation. For such programming an active group of union and business advisors would be absolutely necessary.

Bonding

One of the earliest roadblocks to employment of youths who had been in jail was their lack of eligibility for fidelity bonds. Insurance companies providing blanket bonds to industry and business specifically exclude men with records. A diligent search of potential sources of bonds for men who had been in jail indicated no insurance company was willing to undertake this. The RYT staff together with the American Foundation for Studies in Correction and the Staten Island Mental Health Society, Inc., developed an experimental bonding program with Philip Gordis Associates of New York. As a result, a bonding program was established with International Fidelity Insurance Company of New Jersey making it possible for persons who had been in jail to obtain a $1,000 fidelity bond at the minimal cost of $15.00 per year. This program received national attention and warm approval in correctional and judicial circles. Unfortunately, interstate licensing restrictions have limited its application elsewhere.

Relationships With Other Agencies

Experiences in the RYT project underline the necessity of cooperative relationships with all agencies and services involved in the law enforcement and correctional apparatus. There is an inevitable overlapping of agencies in working with offenders that cannot be ignored. Operational problems and deviation from research design can be minimized by careful prior communication and planning. At a minimum all agencies in the network should be kept informed. Problems arise when agencies are confronted with an expectation that they will adapt to decisions in which they have not been involved. In the RYT project a process was begun through which heads of agencies as well as line-staff responsible for providing direct services to the same boys were brought together to explore joint responsibilities and related and overlapping concerns. This marked a shift toward cooperative service and away from traditional fractioning of services. Because of commitment to the importance of research evaluation of outcomes independent agencies were willing to work together through the research group. Obviously, difficulties can arise when any single agency seeks to evaluate the effectiveness of its services when the effects to be measured are part of another agency's activities (e.g. - If recidivism is used as a criterion in a classical experimental-control design to test the effectiveness of an institutional program, can the design be protected and maintained during the parole period? What implication does this have for Parole Commission and Parole Officer decisions?) Some of these difficulties were awkward at the beginning of RYT, but gradually were cooperatively resolved so that they are very well managed in current ongoing research.

Social Restoration Through Vocational Education

The experiences in RYT, namely; the application of diagnostic procedures and post-release planning while the subjects were still in jail; the use of a Citizens Advisory Committee and public involvement with the jail; the importance of "responsive" vocational training and of matching types of employment with types of boys; and the demonstration of the effectiveness of coordinated educational, institutional, bonding, parole, and post-release services led to the development of the multi-phasic Social Restoration Through Vocational Education (SERVE) Project.

In addition to maintaining a close cooperative relationship with the Department of Correction, SERVE has developed close working relationships with the Parole Commission, the Board of Education and other agencies in the network of services required by ex-inmates of jails. It has focused on the importance of coordinating special parole and post-release services with vocational education to prepare boys for entry level positions in 20 different vocational areas. This allows exploration of alternative work areas. It also allows greater flexibility in job placement when the boy is released from prison.

In contrast with RYT, this new program does not address itself to a training program effective for a single high level entrance job. The emphasis is on developing varied entry-level training and transitional programs. The RYT Study highlighted the fact that considerable psychosocial stress and anxiety are aroused when boys from lower class backgrounds are taught occupational skills which change social position as well as vocational adjustment. Therefore, the new program emphasizes a continuity of service extending from before release until a stable relationship is established within the world of work. At this point, it is uncertain how long this follow-up should continue and what principles must be considered in terminating such a supportive relationship.

CHAPTER VI

PERSPECTIVES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

One hundred and thirty-odd years ago, two distinguished visitors from France made a study of American prisons. They were impressed by much that they saw and were especially attracted to programs and buildings built to handle long term prisoners, but they were appalled to find that:

> ...establishments of a similar nature do not exist to receive individuals who are sentenced for a shorter time...disorder, confusion, mixture of different ages and vile characters still exist for them. These arrested persons are precisely those for whom well-regulated prisons ought to have been built. It is easy in fact, to conceive that he who has committed but a small crime or misdemeanor ought to be surrounded by much greater protection than such as are more advanced in crime...How is it that we should suffer them to find in the prison a corruption which they did not bring with them?

Some of the jails that so distressed these visitors are still in use today. Most of the buildings have been painted several times in the interim and electrical conduits and steam-heat pipes have been built along the corridors, but many still have no toilets or washbasins in the cells - the bucket system is still in use. Moreover, in one antiquated structure designed and built just after the Revolutionary War, the daily routine continues to be so dreary that the 130 year-old criticism quoted above is still valid and parallels the criticisms of a newspaper reporter who made a survey of the same jail last year.

Historically and traditionally, jails have always lagged behind other social developments. Writings about jails in 1956, Myrl Alexander (now Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons) observed that

> ...no other public institution has so consistently and so stubbornly clung to old traditions in the face of broad advances in the sciences concerned with human behavior. In the mid-twentieth century, the jail is essentially unchanged from its methods and character in the pre-Victorian period.[1]

Alexander's observation is still generally valid. In architecture, program and purpose most jails in the United States still reflect more of the 19th century conception of crime than they do of modern concepts and understanding about the nature of crime and criminals. This unfortunate durability of outmoded philosophies, procedures and facilities is not because problems associated with jails have not been recognized. Conditions in local jails have been perennial targets of public indignation. Criticisms and calls for reform appear regularly in editorials, feature articles in magazines and newspapers, and in radio and T.V. documentaries.

---

[1] Alexander, M., Jail Administration, Charles C Thomas, Springfield, Illinois, 1957, p. 326.

Specific jails and jails in general are periodically denounced as "moral cesspools", "schools of crime" and as "society's crime against the criminal". Reformers, feature writers and sober-minded fact-finding commissions repeatedly make nearly identical "surveys" and use almost identical condemnatory language in their reports.

Despite all the polemics, little fundamental change has been effected. As Robinson pointed out after his 1944 survey, "if verbal condemnation alone could do the work, the jail as an institution would have crumbled long ago".[2]

Public condemnation has forced abandonment or renovation of some antiquated buildings and facilities. In many places, sanitary and public health reforms have been instituted. Public opinion also has compelled changes in administrative practices. Dishonesty, corruption and profiteering at the expense of the inmates, which were characteristic a few years ago, have been largely eliminated. Honest administration, sound fiscal procedures and efficient management are now the general rule. Overtly cruel and sadistic practices by staff have been greatly reduced and generally are not officially sanctioned.

Important human values have been expressed in these developments. The gains should not be denigrated. Humane, honest and sanitary operation of a public institution is a critical minimum essential. Nevertheless, evidence of efficient management, neat operational charts, civil service personnel and the addition of a few public health and mental health personnel, should not lead to the delusion that present day jails are radically changed in conception and operation, or that the serious problems of jail inmates are being solved. A thoughtful comparison between the filthy, corrupt, socially infectious jail of yesteryear and its clean, well-managed counterpart today will reveal many continuing shocking similarities in basic objectives and activity.

---

[2] Robinson, L., Jails, Care and Treatment of Misdemeanant Prisoners in the United States, John C. Winston Company, Philadelphia, 1944, P. 111.

Why Haven't Jails Changed?

One of the most significant contributing factors which keeps the American jail in its present form is the general public ignorance and confusion as to the proper role and function of a jail. There are many contradictory and widely divergent beliefs and cluttered impressions about jails. Most local jails are not clearly defined as to function. They are hybrid institutions: holding people pending completion of police investigation, people awaiting court hearing and adjudication, people awaiting transfer to state hospitals and state or federal prisons, as well as people convicted of crimes and serving short-term sentences.

In some metropolitan areas of the country, facilities have been built to separate detained from sentenced prisoners. In most parts of the country, however, all inmates are dumped into a single, conglomerate facility. As a result, the innocent as well as the guilty, the suspected and the accused, the unsentenced and the sentenced, the young and the old, the inexperienced and the sophisticate in crime, petty and serious offenders are locked together in a regime which emphasizes routine and control.

Jails have not changed because society is emotional rather than rational about jails. Jails are not rationally planned institutions. They have grown out of gradual accretions of public and social responsibility...in response to fear, and through hasty improvisation and emergency solutions in times of crisis...improvisations which subsequently were perpetuated in public policy as they were allowed to continue without review, and as expensive public buildings were erected.

Changes in jail operation are likely to occur only when a crisis (e.g., a riot or accidental death of an inmate) momentarily fixes public attention on the shortcomings of the institution. In such cases, however, the tendency is to handle the most immediate proximate causes of difficulty. The search for other factors and analysis of more fundamental causes are postponed until later and may never be undertaken at all. As a result, the current validity of outmoded premises in the social assignment and operation of the jail, are rarely examined.

As in ancient times, the basic operating premise is still that the jail is merely a place of incarceration for people considered to be a threat to society. In carrying out this assignment the jail simply takes custody of persons legally committed to its control and holds them securely until they can be released by due process of law. Public insistence that the process of holding must be humane and that civil servants charged with responsibility for control must be honest does not constitute a real shift in traditional concepts, nor does it truly enlarge the nature of the social assignment. Traditional custodial premises are dominant and their validity still relatively unchallenged.

Over the years, additional functions have been assigned or assumed by jails. For the most part these additional functions have been assimilated within prevailing frames of reference. Even when crises seem to demand socially constructive solutions, the crises are most often resolved in defeatist ways, using traditional custodial patterns. It is as if the deep-seated and unreasoning public patterns of thinking about criminals brook no thorough review or systematic evaluation. Traditional beliefs and cliches about people in jail are invoked as supportive evidence of the "need" to retain traditional practices. Meanwhile, the community, having momentarily isolated the offender, relaxes with a false sense of security without concern for the individual inmate and his imminent return.

Humanitarian reforms have been introduced into many jails with but little impact on traditional concepts regarding the purpose and role of jails. A kindly keeper with more formal education may be substituted for a brutal, ignorant keeper. The title of "correctional officer" may be substituted for "keeper" with no change in the role and function of the position.

Administrative reforms often do little more than streamline procedures and practices which still are based on traditional attitudes and practices. When this happens, it must be clear that no essential reform of jail philosophy has occurred. The jail merely becomes a better managed, more hygienic, and more efficient storage facility.

In jails dealing with large populations the combination of efficiency and concern for security can produce a routine which is highly efficient from a management point of view but which can be destructive and wasteful of human resources of both staff and inmates.

For example, the jail in a big city must deal with a huge volume of offenders coming into the institution as virtual unknowns, with widely varying potentials for response. Regularized procedures and routines help manage the uncertainty and anticipated danger in this situation. Efficiency meshes neatly with the simplistic requirements of custody and control. Smoothly coordinated procedures and detailed schedules for controlling movements of prisoners in and around the jail and for housing, clothing and feeding them during the period of their incarceration have been substituted for some of the direct physical restraints that were imposed in earlier times. The activity of "processing" inmates, and the flow of men through schedules and routine, is controlling in itself. A small number of correctional officers can maintain an easy surveillance under these circumstances because any single infraction is likely to stand out starkly against the background of the regularity and predictability of the system. Moreover, by focusing on "processing" concerns, administrative efficiency and routine equity, the staff may rationalize some of the impersonality and rigidity of their daily work. To a degree they convince themselves and others that a quiet institution must be a good institution.

It is easy to criticize jails. A more vulnerable target among social institutions would be difficult to find. The average jail administrator is quite aware of the limitations in his institution. Usually, he can list deficiencies more quickly and precisely than any investigating commission or outside reform group. He readily can identify needed changes and facilities which should be substituted. But, he also knows the captious hostility and studied indifference of society. A public institution, forced to operate in a climate of contradiction, hostility and indifference is most likely to develop an internal climate of conservatism. In such an internal climate, resistance to change becomes a virtue. Motivation to modernize and up-date the system is threatening and so is suppressed. The guiding theme becomes one of "no untimely headlines". Throughout the agency the prevailing expectation is that only a minimum service level can be expected or maintained. As a result the jail becomes little more than a human warehouse, operating as a processing agency with assembly line methods; dominated by rules rather than principles and giving little more than lip-service to the idea of functioning as an organization for change and social restoration of inmates.

Finally, jails have not changed because centuries-old ideas and beliefs about the purposes of jails remain deeply rooted in society. A brief sketch of major historical developments may provide a basis for better understanding of current practice.

A Brief Historical Perspective

In colonial days, the American jail was patterned after the English jail. It was a local facility run by the local sheriff and exploited by him for whatever revenue he could squeeze out of it.[3] The prime purpose of the jail was to hold people awaiting trial and judgment. It also held the offender until he was brought forth for the execution of imposed penalties. The usual penalties were death, mutilation, branding, flogging and banishment.

---

[3] In many places, the sheriff is still the chief administrative officer for the jail. Generally, he is also a politician. At best this introduces an uncertain quality into administration.

The idea of using imprisonment itself as a punitive penalty emerged in the 19th century as part of the new evaluation of human life that began to emerge in that era.

A logical framework for using the jail for punishment to facilitate change was developed by the early Quakers in Pennsylvania. They reasoned that if an offender were isolated from all human contact, to work in loneliness, with time for quiet reflection, Bible reading and introspection, he would discover that error of his ways. Repentant, he might return to society with an inward commitment to abide by the law. This philosophy was very carefully expressed in the Pennsylvania law which provided for "imprisonment at labor by separate and solitary confinement". The significance of this precise legal phrasing may be passed over too quickly by readers who do not know the history of penology in the United States. These carefully selected words not only provided the guidelines for prison practice but they also helped determine the unique architecture and design of the buildings in which prisoners lived. Literally, the buildings were designed so that the offender lived in nearly complete isolation. He had only limited contact with prison officials and even less contact with anyone else. He worked and lived in his individual cell and exercise yard for the entire period of his incarceration.

This treatment did not produce the results for which the

Quakers hoped. The depersonalization and loss of human perspective caused by such deliberate, total isolation were so destructive that the primary operational elements of the system had to be dropped.

In the United States today, there is no real attempt to carry out the sentence of "imprisonment at labor by separate and solitary confinement". Cumbersome residuals of the past do exist in the form of outmoded prisons built on the lines of the Pennsylvania system, and in the language of old laws which have not been changed, although modern practice negates literal interpretation of the sentence. However, the ideas of *confinement as a means to correction* and *imprisonment as punishment* spread rapidly through the western world. Imprisonment is now the major form of punishment used.

Changes in the patterns of punishment changed the jail. As a consequence of increasing use of imprisonment as punishment there was a need for larger facilities to hold the numbers of people being confined for long periods of time. Many large State-prisons were built. Still later, the reformatory movement, conceived as a program to remove young offenders from local jails and from contacts with criminal adults, further reduced the numbers of persons held in the local jail.

With the development of reformatories and state prisons, the jail presumably might have fallen back into its traditional function as a place of detention. But the concepts of humanitarianism and the belief that confinement might prove to be equally useful for less serious offenders as well, moved the jail toward becoming a short-term sentencing institution. As ancient forms of public humiliation and punishment for minor offenders were abandoned, short-term sentences in jail were substituted. In a relatively brief period of time the local jail was established as a place of temporary detention in accordance with its ancient function, and also as a convenient facility for local judges and magistrates to use as a place of punishment and for sentencing of minor offenders.

"Houses of Corrections" and "Workhouses" also have contributed to the character of today's jail although their beginnings were based on separate concepts and they were not devised as punitive institutions. They were established under different laws, with different operating philosophies and in buildings specifically designed for them. Some of these laws and philosophies have been assimilated in current patterns of jail administration.

Originally, the house of correction and the workhouse were intended to meet the pressing problems of large scale vagrancy and unemployment. In 16th century England large numbers of idle people roamed the countryside. Many who were willing to work were unable to get employment. Others would not work unless compelled to do so. Many young people needed to be trained to work and others were partially incapacitated.

The English jail was not then used as a common punishment for crime, nor was the jail perceived as having much to do with the above mentioned four groups of idle people.

Workhouses were developed as institutions for those who wanted to work. Houses of correction were developed as separate institutions for those who should be compelled to work and as training schools for youths who had received no training at home, on the farm or in industry.

In colonial America, workhouses and houses of correction were similarly conceptualized as being separate from the local jail. In the laws and charters of the colonies they were established as institutions for children and people who were poor, and for handling idle and vagrant persons. However, in several instances, the laws indicate that until suitable facilities could be built, the county prison could serve as the workhouse and/or the house of correction. This permissive use of the jail sometimes was followed by subsequently building another institution adjacent to the jail. In other instances, no physical separation ever occurred. In either event, because of the physical proximity of buildings and the efficiency of having a single administration and with the trend to substitute imprisonment and work for more drastic forms of punishment the distinction between houses of correction workhouses and county jails have become quite blurred. Today, all are used for the short-term imprisonment of petty offenders. Distinctions sometimes are made in terms of the length of sentence or as a way of differentiating between detention and sentencing facilities in a single jurisdiction. The terms are sometimes used to differentiate municipal from county functions; e.g., City "workhouse", and County "jail". Such differences are more apparent than real. For the most part, the older names sound as a discontinuous echo from the past. However, some of the contradictory aspects of mid-twentieth century jails such as the large number of alcoholics, vagrants, and non-support cases in jail, are partly a residual of this evolution.

Implications for Developing Treatment Programs in Jail

While the ancient penalties either destroyed the offender or so marked him that his social role in society was clearly identified as he returned to the community, the use of imprisonment as a punishment resulted in large numbers of offenders being returned, with clearly visible marks to "warn" society against them. As a result, in addition to requiring that the offender be held securely during the period of his incarceration, it also became important to require that he be changed or "corrected" at the same time. Initially, it was assumed that men would be deterred from further criminal acts simply because it would be important to avoid further imprisonment. As Reckless has pointed out,

> The existing framework of our correctional system in the United States is, to a large extent, based upon a belief in an assumed miracle of reformation, namely, that if offenders are given the means to reform, they will reform...good time laws, penitentiary, reformatories, indeterminant sentences, parole and probation...All these agencies were supposed to place reformation in the hands of the offender.[4]

Gradually, society has come to recognize that the problem is more complex. As social science and research have increased man's understanding of himself, and as more knowledge has been accumulated about the ways in which human nature can be directed and modified, there has come a corresponding increase in the social expectation that jails should assume responsibility for changing the individual offender, so he will be less of a threat to the community when he is released. However, some of the difficulty encountered in establishing adequate programs within jails is due to the inclination to regard various aspects of the social assignment as if they were essentially additive in their relationships and effect. Thus, for example, it has been assumed that rehabilitative roles can simply be added to the custodial roles of personnel. However, studies have shown that contradictory directives are involved in these different roles.[5]

---

[4] Reckless, W.C., "An Experimental Basis for Revision of Correctional Programs", Federal Probation, Vol. VI, No. 1, 1942, pp. 24-26.

[5] Cressey, D.R., "Contradictory Directives in Complex Organizations: The Case of the Prison", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 4, No. 1, June 1959.

Much of the resistance to innovation in the jail comes from within the institution itself. It arises, in large part, because the social assignment has evolved in a piecemeal fashion. Contradictory elements in the multiple missions and programs that have been pushed together create an organizational strain which results in a conflicted non-functional resolution favoring simple custody and the status quo.

The experience of RYT was most revealing in this regard. Despite the fact that the project was received with a great deal of individual support and personal good will at all levels of work, the social structure and rationale of the system was a constant, corrosive, vitiating influence. Correctional workers and social scientists who try to fit demonstration programs and research projects into a jail setting are likely to be faced with much the same type of situation as surgeons trying to transplant a healthy kidney from one human being to another. The body of the recipient may be in dire need of the service which can be provided by the transplant, and the recipient himself may be anxious for its success, but the patterned defenses of the body are so ingrained and so organized to maintain the status quo that the goals of the operation may be achieved with great difficulty.

For a research program to be effective in a jail setting, a number of factors must be considered. These include:

1. The ever-present implication of threat to society suggested by having gathered a body of criminals in one place.
2. The resultant over-riding and anxious preoccupation with custody and control by staff and inmates.
3. The difficulties of using research techniques and methodologies appropriate to scientific application in such circumstances.
4. The shortage of qualified personnel, experienced in both research and corrections, who can bridge a gap between science and service.
5. The resistance to change in the various institutional and bureaucratic structures involved in working with prisoners and ex-inmates of jails.
6. The self-contradicting social assignment given the jail to execute a retributive and vengeful punishment and to simultaneously establish a rehabilitative service with minimum cost to the public.

Research is a low priority item in jail administration. Administrators are quite aware that tenure is not dependent upon developing a research capacity in their programs. As a result, the average administrator really knows very little about research as a field. If improved programs are to be developed in jails, research is necessary. If research in jail settings is to be effective, jail-administrators must become more knowledgeable about research. It is not necessary that they be highly sophisticated in research methods and their application, but misconceptions should be corrected and a clear understanding of operational differences and objectives of different types of research should be developed. (e.g, differences between evaluative and experimental approaches) It would be appropriate to develop training materials and training institutes to orient jail administrators and senior personnel to the values, limitations, requirements, methods and varieties of research.

The experience of RYT suggests that this could be a fruitful expenditure of time and effort. One of the important issues in RYT was concerned with the development of a "field laboratory" relationship and with the systematic assignment of segments of the jail population required in an experimental-control research design. Although many difficulties were encountered in this regard, the solutions that emerged and the relationships that developed provide a useful pattern for effective collaboration between social science research and correctional practice. Prior planning and early involvement of all administrative and service units is crucial. Conflict between the objectives of service and the objectives of research can be minimized. Each requires sensitive scheduling, definition of goals and procedures, careful reporting of information. If points of conflict are anticipated and plans for handling the needs of science and the needs of practice are made in advance, then productive and complementary working relationships can be established. Continuation of an effective working relationship depends on consistent frequent feedback, sound patterns of communication, and regular review to make sure that major decision-making is a product of joined participation.

The nature of the inmate population presents some problems for the design and operation of research in jail settings. Although inmates are regarded as a danger to society they are still relatively unknown in terms of the psychological, social and cultural values and behavior systems they represent. They have not been the subject of much research. Most of the available research tools and techniques have been developed with middle class groups. It is necessary to make significant modifications in currently used methodologies and to develop new instruments and tactics for use with this population. But such developments require further accumulation of data and knowledge.

Thus, for example, in addition to screening subjects who have the necessary intellectual capacity to absorb vocational training, some better measures of motivation level are needed.

Men in training programs in the short-term institution are not unmotivated. Rather, their motivational patterns are different. They want the same things that other people want, both in terms of material comforts and inter-personal relationships. However, the paths for achieving these objectives seem cluttered and complicated. Thus, manipulation and motivation for a "better deal" must be distinguished from motivation towards work on a particular task. The pervasive, generalized motivation in the climate of a jail for the inmate to improve his position and ease his stay while in the institution is separate from the hope of improving his position on the outside. This must be considered in any selection process. For example, in an experimental-control design, disclosure of who is in the control group will result in a reversal of pattern for this type of motivation.

Current tests of motivation are not appropriate for use with a verbally unsophisticated population. They require too much paper and pencil skill. This limits the reliability of scores. If written tests must be used, standardization should be developed for this population.

The reasons for testing must be taught as part of the total experience for these boys. Much more than "rapport-building" is needed. Testing and diagnosis must be made part of the process of the boy's self-discovery. This requires a systematic, careful "feedback" and a sharing of findings.

Decisions based on the findings should be tempered by mutual evaluation. The pertinence of diagnosis and testing has to be developed gradually in the minds of these boys. This is as much a part of training for transition as anything else. Of course, such a requirement places burdens on the test-makers, test-givers and test-interpreters. First, they must be sure that the tests really are pertinent and second, they must be prepared to provide fairly simple, but honest and meaningful explanations about why testing is done and of what has been discovered.

Diagnosis must include some evaluation of the adjustment patterns which have contributed to the person's inability to utilize training experiences. Actually several stages or phases might be projected and time for diagnosis extended. Analysis of actual "work-samples" and experiences of training graduates should be fitted into the diagnostic process. Finally, for greatest effect there must be a continuous relationship between diagnostic and training programs.

Implications in RYT for the Design of Future Research

As has been indicated at several places in this report, working relationships between RYT, the Department of Correction and the Parole Commission often were tense and strained. Many of the circumstances producing tension were not created de novo by the arrival of RYT, but were re-enactments of already existing conflicts within the structure of the correctional agencies: viz., the conflict between "rehabilitation" and "custody" roles.

For most of the personnel of the jail, RYT was merely another activity to be assimilated within the heterogeneity of the correctional system and so was "understood", catalogued and handled in terms of prevailing frames of reference. Thus, before RYT staff had established themselves on their own merits they were identified with roles e.g., "longhaired professors" and thereby committed to allegiances that were not of their own choosing and that did not accurately reflect the purposes of the project.

Because of its service objectives, RYT was perceived by many correctional workers as being aligned with rehabilitative functions. However, Department of Correction rehabilitation staff tended to regard RYT as a brash upstart and interloper. There was some bitterness in this attitude. A favored program of the Rehabilitation Division was disrupted and discarded to provide space for RYT. The rehabilitation division had previously had a pre-release program for adolescents housed in the minimum security cottages outside the locked perimeter of the institution. Custodial personnel had been uneasy about this situation, but had accomodated to it because staff in the pre-release cottages were known to be loyal to overall institutional policies and took responsibility for preventing violations of security. The custodial personnel were not equally sure of RYT staff.

Later, when RYT trainees broke into a candy machine, the incident was used as the "legitimate" basis for moving the trainees back into the locked area of the jail every evening. The breach between rehabilitation and research created by the RYT displacement of the pre-release program played a significant although unverbalized role in this decision. Both custody and rehabilitation staffs felt that RYT had mismanaged the living situation and had "rejected" advice both from rehabilitation and custody personnel on how to operate in the minimum security area. Because of its dissociation from departmental sources of support for rehabilitative activities, RYT was left to stand entirely on its own, with the general philosophy being "they made their own bed, now let them lie in it." The restrictive action of moving trainees from the cottages to the cell-block provided the Rehabilitation Division with an opportunity to enhance its own reputation and to stress their earlier "effectiveness" in running a program in the unlocked area. Simultaneously, it allowed the custodial functionaries of the institution to remove a long-standing "threat" to security as if they were handling only a specific, short-term problem. Finally, in terms of institutional management of inmates, differences between RYT and other institutional programs were reduced. Accordingly, organizational strain was reduced.

Some of these difficulties were inevitable but if RYT staff had more prior awareness of the dynamics of the network of relationships considerable staff stress could have been avoided. If the RYT staff had known about conflicting social assignments facing the modern jailer, they would not have taken the daily interactions with custodial personnel so personally. If they had been aware that old anxieties and hostilities around the security issue were being renewed and that unresolved conflicts would be reawakened by their arrival they might have benefited from the practical experience of the custodial staff.

RYT researchers discovered that the authority to establish rules, routines and facilities necessary for research were in the hands of operational personnel in a chain of command not responsible to or for research. When they wished a decision or action to occur, they had to communicate to the topmost echelons of Department authority where a bridge to operations existed and where policy could be communicated back down to the operating facility and line staff. As a result, research staff were identified with the Commissioner's office. A feeling of competition and frustration was induced in line correctional staff whose roles were shifted by directives without recourse. The daily experience of correctional officers dealing with RYT was one of confronting a group whose work was regarded as desirable, but whose identification with institutional responsibilities and commitments was questioned. Operation staff viewed RYT staff as naive and vulnerable to conning by inmates. RYT staff tended to view operational staff as obstructionistic, rigid and ridden by rules which didn't seem reasonable and necessary.

Any future program to develop research or demonstration projects in jail settings should budget time, money and personnel to develop mutual staff understanding of roles, responsibilities and aspirations in work. Part of the problem in RYT was that the necessity to man on-going programs did not allow sufficient time for either research or institutional staff to get together and establish such understanding.

In this connection, within the project itself there were conflicts between service and research needs. Most of this strain occurred because the amount of work required to successfully provide services and to follow up cases in the community had been incorrectly judged and financed at the start of the program. The project directors were faced with a matter of choosing between service and research objectives. This was difficult, because service objectives were intimately linked with research variables. If a boy was not placed on a job or did not receive transitional services, the research hypothesis would not be tested. On the other hand, if jobs and services were provided, the systematic collection of follow up information for research analysis would be impaired by lack of staff. Both aspects of the program suffered.

However, with the conviction that follow-up would be meaningless unless the program was carried out, follow-up activities were slighted. This deficiency was repaired by later developing a separate follow-up study phase.

There are some important lessons to be learned from these experiences. There is a tendency in planning research related to living situations and human services to plan the research activities as "observer" functions rather than as "participant" functions. However, there is need for research and service to be blended under conditions of careful coordination and controlled observation. Obviously there are differences in the ways in which these two activities achieve their goals and a planned interaction and coordinated responsibility will require much thought. Difficulties may arise if the search for facts is pressed too vigorously by the researcher, without due regard for human and social needs, or when the practical worker feels that immediate, timely response to service needs is all that really matters. It is unreasonable to adopt either point of view to the exclusion of the other. Both tested knowledge and skilled workers are needed; reliable techniques and valid information which can be applied with clinical ingenuity are also in short supply.

The Need for a Pilot Study in Planning RYT Types of Research

Many of the problems outlined in the preceding paragraphs could have been managed with greater effectiveness if there had been a thorough pilot study preceding the project. Attempts were made to anticipate difficulties, and for the most part these were appropriate and helpful. They were limited, however, and did not go far enough. The complexities of interagency relationships and the smooth integration of research and service needs in a coordinated program must be worked out through experience with actual cases. No amount of good will and administrative working agreements can be substituted for the revealing and corrective experience of following a few cases through the entire sequence and flow of a proposed activity.

There are techniques available which might be used profitably in such prior review and planning. In recent years, industry has concerned itself with analysis of the man hours and relationships between sequences of activity necessary to complete a task within an organizational setting. In order to meet goals, they must be realistic. Moreover, it has been found that setting realistic objectives improves morale and increases efficiency.

Pilot Systems Analysis

In the early phases of RYT unrealistic man hour goals were established which caused frustration, disappointment and apathy. Before such a training program is started, a careful pilot survey should establish the number of hours required to perform the contemplated tasks. This should be followed by an appraisal of the number of hours available (in RYT's case, within the institution). From these figures, holidays, weekends, vacations, etc., should be deducted to fit with the patterns and regulations of the organization in which the project is set. Without such a systems analysis of the agency and its relationships to the research operation, pre-planning is likely to be ineffective.

Pilot Staff Job Market Evaluation

Similarly, a thorough survey of the job market should be undertaken as part of pilot study. Such a survey should not only note the number of jobs that are available, but should establish guidelines as to the actual determinants involved in placement and hiring. In the RYT experience, for example, many positions for which boys were trained were available in the market, but required, in most cases, not only a high school diploma but also an ability to be bonded. In neither case did trainees qualify.

RYT trainees were able to compete successfully if they were given the opportunity. Unfortunately, employers also discriminated against trainees because of their criminal histories.

Civil Service has become the largest employer of white-collar personnel in the country. They also have fostered the development of an ethical merit system and integrated hiring and promotional practices. It is paradoxical, therefore, that civil-service agencies are among the most reluctant in considering ex-inmates as employees. In some cases, where individuals might be working with prison or police files such restrictions may have some value. However, blanket restrictions which prevent employment in government agencies that have nothing to do with enforcement or correctional services seems unreasonable. Perhaps Civil Service practices and rules could be modified to provide improved opportunities to ex-offenders who otherwise qualify.

Implications in RYT Relevant to Placing Boys in the Job Market

Work With Employers: A few large-scale employers can be expected to offer positions to ex-offenders on the basis of humanitarian feelings. However, to meet the real needs of jails, employment of this population must be economically and socially worthwhile for the employer. Given the current attitudes of general society, the employer who hires a culturally deprived and delinquent employee with a poor vocational history is assuming additional risk. Perhaps some financial support could be generated to share the risk with the employer as well as the employee through this period of transition.

Vocational training offers a rationale which can be used to open opportunities in the world of work that are usually closed to ex-prisoners. But training should be followed up. It cannot be expected that employers will know how to interpret problems which may arise as the boy adapts to a new role as an employee. It is important for the sponsoring agency to maintain a continuing relationship to handle the employer's concerns and problems as he works with his new employee.

Boys who had worked in IBM related jobs were fairly well remembered. However, the follow up interviewers were shocked by the number of boys in the study who were not remembered by their employers nor by the people who had worked with them. In some cases this was due to the fact that employment had been so brief that there were only meager recollections and superficial records. However, even with longer periods of employment, many young men did not leave an impression of individuality. Employers suggested that these young men were fairly typical representatives of numberless young people who come and go in low status jobs. Unless some particular trouble was caused or unless the boy was still employed by the company, he rarely was remembered as a personality. This quality of "invisibility" was more characteristic of controls than experimentals. However, it also was a factor for some of the experimental group. In many cases, the job developer is remembered with more clarity, understanding and appreciation of personality than is true for the boy who worked in the business. In fairness, it should be noted that it was not possible in every case to interview the person who directly supervised the boy at work. Frequently follow up interviews were with the persons responsible for hiring; either the owner, manager of the company or personnel manager. Obviously, in these situations, the job development and placement worker had an opportunity to make a more enduring impression. Nevertheless, the follow up interviews revealed a pervasive anonimity and facelessness of youth at work.

Provisions should be made to maintain a continuous and helpful contact with employers. Opening the job is not sufficient in itself. To terminate contact with the trainee and employer immediately after placement is as much a pattern of social reinsertion as any that have been criticized. In fact, the stress encountered by a released offender who is placed in a job opportunity that was previously closed to him is likely to be more difficult and severe than will be met by an offender who finds his own job. In other words, a program of training, job development and placement - without continuity of service and follow up with employer and trainee - may precipitate a crisis and sequence of response that will contribute to recidivism and failure on the job. The experience of RYT indicates that such stressful situations were created for trainees. Experimental boys were placed in work situations where work adjustments, requirements for promotion and social demands were more stressful.

RYT intervention induced many employers to take boys who were below their ordinary standards for employment. In some cases openings were made for boys who had less education, less adequate speech skills, and less attractive than the usual employees engaged for that quality of job. As a result, 41% of the RYT employers indicated that they wanted help to continue the boy in further employment. Because of its limited staff, RYT could meet fewer than 1/3 of these requests. While because of the efforts of RYT job developers, many employers agreed to hire trainees who were below their usual standards, control group boys, generally, went into jobs which were ordinarily available. The social skills and occupational maturity of these jobs were often at lower levels than those in which the RYT experimentals were employed. However, the rate of job failure among trainees in the first few days and weeks following placement indicates that special attention should be given this period.

Some regular contact should have been established to give reassurance in the beginning stages and see that the opportunities which had been opened actually were preserved and used.

One frequently recurrent comment by trainees who were placed in a data processing job was regret that they had been unable to maintain themselves in those jobs. Many of them indicated that they were unaccustomed to the changed social relationships involved in the working situation and the circumstances of work created such stresses on them that they were not able to completely measure up to the work and job requirements. It became obvious during the course of some interviews that the training and placement had not always made adjustment easier. At times, an opposite effect was triggered. Adjustment was more difficult. Lower class boys found themselves in middle class settings and were expected to perform effectively. Many of them found the social relationships difficult to handle. This may explain in part, a large number of boys who left the job without giving notice, although from their employers point of view they were successful in production and technical achievement.

New kinds of problems were generated by placing ex-offenders in areas of work with different social values, but the new problems at least have the prospect of being resolved in a constructive fashion. Programming to sustain ex-inmates under the stress of trying to "pass" requires much more sensitive awareness and planning than has been the case heretofore. The kind of supportive services required are rather like services required for a retarded person moving out of a sheltered workshop. The social deficit, limited perspective and low tolerance for normal stress in the ex-inmate population appear as a kind of social "amentia" when they are challenged by an average business office or industrial setting.

Work With the Community

The youthful inmate has many adjustment problems over and beyond adaptation to work. They are unsuccessful in the use of their leisure time, in their family relationships and in their general adaptation to the community. Many more resources and living experiences are required than can be offered by any job or employer. To develop appropriate resources for this population, an intensive effort must be undertaken to change the community's attitude of rejection or watchful toleration to a willingness to develop resources supporting readjustment of these young men.

One of the most fruitful areas for community action is the development of a community residential center or "halfway house" for released offenders. The transition from the controlled jail setting to self-management in free society is a giant step for many releasees. The problems of finding a suitable place to live, searching for jobs, and accepting the responsibilities of community life can be helped to a considerable degree by such a program. The lack of a community residential center was keenly felt by RYT.

The experience reported by the most successful centers indicates that full utilization of community resources and informed support by the community is essential to success. As offenders are provided a base from which they can develop as self-sustaining citizens, the community also arrives at a better understanding of crime and the responsibility of free citizens to meet correctional and social restoration needs in a realistic fashion.

Secondary Effects of Training Within the Jail

A well organized, comprehensive program of training and education has considerable relevance for life and morale within the jail as well as for life following release.

A major problem in any correctional institution is how to keep prisoners occupied. Usually there is not enough productive, meaningful work to provide the total inmate population with a full day's work. State and Federal institutions have developed comprehensive prison industries and "state-use" formulas which allow them to sell their products to state or federal agencies. However, jails have encountered difficulties in developing similar programs. The results - enforced idleness and dead time - are particular problems in such local institutions.

Idealism is an important sustaining personal quality helpful in working in prisons and jails. However, idealists should be prepared for the cynicism of those they wish to help. In the eyes of the offenders, training is but a part of all the procedures carried out in jail, and the offenders do not always welcome educators or researchers.

A training program in a jail can be seen by the inmate as part of punishment. Exploration of ways of preventing this suggests that, as far as possible, training should be related to the personal need system of the inmate involved. Immediate as well as long-term needs should be noted. For example, RYT was demonstrated to have immediate value as an escape from boredom of the prison. Initially, the trainees felt it was a prestigeful activity within the institution and the group of inmates operated with a high morale level. Certainly, with planning and deliberate staging, such status can be deliberately created within the jail and related to status in the free community. Further, RYT has also shown that the prospect of meaningful employment is a powerful motivation for many young men.

Use of Jail Inmates as Training Cadre

To enhance a positive self-image to increase learning and to aid the transition towards improved self-management, graduate trainees should serve as cadre for the next. Teaching may contribute to learning and relationships between peers may facilitate the process of learning for this population. Starting a "Big Brother" program in the jail classroom will not only aid in promoting self-management but aid in promoting the material to be learned as well. Such a program assumes that the graduates will not be released immediately upon completion of training. Smaller classes, better screening devises and closer initial supervision would be required, but it is felt that the rewards of increased involvement would well be worth it.

This would also require closer coordination with the Parole Commission, or the releasing agent. There should be a steady turnover of trainees so that each could benefit from the experience of learning and teaching others.

Remedial Education

It is clear that a major vocational handicap for a culturally deprived and disadvantaged population is the lack of communications skills.

One method that was effective in RYT was the use of programmed reading instruction. Standard academic remedial reading techniques often do not seem to be effective with the jailed population. The S.R.A. programmed booklets used by RYT were effective enough to suggest that similar programmed approaches have a major potential for developing reading and arithmetic skills in a group of people who tend to reject and resist more traditional patterns. These boys seem to tolerate such learning experiences well. But such approaches do not confront the central problem of relating to and learning from persons in positions of authority. A combination of approaches is indicated.

Reading, communication skills, arithmetic and vocational skills must be integrated with realities of work and living.

New approaches, new curricula and new educational materials, tailored to meet the demands of this setting and population, are required. It is not sufficient to have instructors who are skilled vocational educators as such.

In addition to ability to communicate trade and skill knowledge to the boy, they must also be able to relate to him in such a way that inmates can identify with him and through him to the world of work. The vocational instructor has a larger task than communicating skill knowledge. This also implies a new role for the vocational education instructor. He must be capable in several areas and flexible enough to shift from one goal to the next as opportunities appear.

New curricula must be developed to be effective during short-term stay. Lesson plans and coverage should be oriented toward preparing a boy for an entry level position with a future growth potential or for education and training which will continue after he leaves the jail. Foremost, the lesson approach must be geared to boys who have negative motivation as the result of poor past experience with vocational education. Vocational education for this population should be rewarding as an activity in and of itself in order to maintain interest. Materials used should be interesting and relevant to the modern world of work. Such a curriculum will require special planning and related materials.

Another guiding point for writing new curricula is that realistically the industries into which these boys can move will accept them only at entry level positions. Industry tends to hire and train young men for specific ways of performing on the job which are standard in a particular plant.

At semi-skilled levels the employer is more interested in hiring young men who are familiar with the tools used in that industry and who are willing to learn, rather than hiring young men highly trained in specific skills.

The ancient words from which the modern word "jail" was derived meant a "cage". Today's cell-block in a jail is still obviously a cage.

Learning to live in a cage does not prepare a man for freedom, self-management and social responsibility. If a person is to learn to assume normal responsibilities and be reasonably effective in the world of work, then he should be trained for freedom, responsibility, and cooperation rather than for dependency or rebellion.

This is not an argument to eliminate social control and to do away with institutions for maintaining social control, but it is an argument against continuing the philosophy of caging. The real issue is not whether society should exercise control over deviance, but rather whether the kind of control being exercised is appropriate and as effective and valuable as it should be.

No one is going to deny the necessity for keeping prisoners securely, but modern architecture and modern construction methods have a capacity to build facilities for housing a modern advanced correctional practice without sacrificing security. Society still builds cages based on 18th and 19th century designs because of vested interests and because of a persisting caging philosophy. It is time to change the beliefs and attitudes which continue to foster the building of expensive cages using toms of tool-proof steel and to replace them with programs based on today's knowledge.

Implications for new Programs to Replace Jails

As a result of rigorous application of rational processes, large expenditures of money and coordinated teamwork by many well-disciplined and convinced people, it seems likely that a man soon will view the Earth while standing on the moon and will return to tell us about his experience. It is well known, however, that society has been reluctant to be equally rational and dedicated in seeking solutions to such social management problems as are presented by the jail in American Society. At best, only an uneasy equilibrium between rational and irrational forces has been obtained.

However, there is a considerable body of applicable knowledge and enough expert agreement about goals to enable society to develop a rational design for changing people sentenced to jail and to effect significant reductions in their rate of return to criminal behavior. The RYT data have made a significant contribution to this body of knowledge and provide some important guidelines about one of the core dimensions in a rational program: (i.e.) the management of transition from jail to the world of work and the development of psychosocial stability aroused a suitable work role.

By itself, participation in a well-designed and well-taught program of vocational training is not going to make "good" citizens out of offenders. The mere acquisition of some skills for which there are openings in the job market will not cause inmates to perceive human relationships from the viewpoint of free citizens who are working in similar jobs. But such training can be "corrective" to the degree that it has a potential for altering reference group relationships, post-release associations, and inmate perceptions of alternative patterns of response. Most offenders do not turn to crime simply as a way of earning a living. Training young men to be IBM operators may not affect criminality directly, but it does stimulate a different attitude toward the world of work and opens the individual to different experiences and new options in deciding how he will spend his life. Further, such special training provides an opportunity to manage the transition from jail to community so that released inmates can be moved into situations which are dominated by essentially non-criminal social relationships. If the ex-inmate can be supported so that the experience is successful and rewarding, in his terms, this kind of social situation provides an opportunity to develop identifications with non-criminal persons, and techniques, values, and resources for maintaining such identifications. These factors reduce the likelihood of recurrent delinquency. Ordinarily, both the working situation and the home neighborhood of the released offender are saturated with attitudes conducive to delinquency.

Instead of concentrating on finding improved ways of holding people, the jail should be oriented toward finding better ways of releasing them. To focus on holding activities is to remain fixated at the beginning of the process. Looking forward to release opens the possibility of planning a sequence of deliberate intervention to prevent recidivism.

A caging philosophy tends to support an isolation and withdrawal from society that limits both the keeper and the kept. A release-oriented philosophy implies a clearly ongoing and out-reaching relationship with the community and its social institutions. The offender is not excluded from society, but is maintained as a member of society and helped to improve his position even though he is under a temporary, legally imposed handicap.

Today's jail should be changed to become a diagnostic, planning and staging center for community social-restoration of offenders. It should be designed as a transitional structure fostering social mobility. To be effective, such a structure requires:

1. A recognition that persistent patterns of criminal behavior have a functional value in the life of the offender. Alternative, non-criminal patterns are likely to be accepted as substitutes only to the degree that they satisfy the same values.

2. A capacity to effect self-identification by offenders with persons, roles and situations which are identified with non-criminal attitudes and activities. At the present time work roles seem to offer the greatest potential for this sort of experience.

3. Access to the network of services, work roles and opportunities in the community which are associated with non-criminal activities; with power to place and maintain ex-inmates in rewarding relationships within the network.

4. A capacity to create opportunities for disadvantaged men with criminal histories to move upward on the occupational scale and to provide a continuum of service which begins while the offender is in the jail and extends beyond initial placement in the community.

The program objectives of a community social restoration center would emerge from:

1. A sound functional evaluation of problems and factors inferfering with self-regulated life in the community. This diagnosis would be used as a basis for engineering an individually selected program and treatment strategy for the offender while he is in the institution and should anticipate the kinds of follow up needed when he leaves the institution.
2. A compensatory education service related to potential work roles and transitional experiences in the community. The curriculum and methods of teaching should be related to real work requirements and situations.
3. A graduated program of release providing for increasing amounts of self-regulation in the institution and an opportunity to practice social roles under conditions of limited stress in the institution and later in a community residential center and work-release experience.

Facilities should be designed to enhance the program objectives outlined above. In correctional institutions there has been a general tendency to build massive permanent structures. Particularly in the physical environments created to be devoted to training and education, corrections should follow the pattern of business and industry and should build to allow flexibility and up-dating of equipment, procedures and practices. In living areas housing should be built to induce self-regulation.

New standards for measuring accomplishment in terms of successful rehabilitation of offenders rather than limitation of escapes and injury requires training and consultation so that staff may successfully perform new roles. In this connection, Dan Glaser notes:

> In the prison of tomorrow there will be much concern with utilizing the personal relationships between staff and inmates for rehabilitative purposes. This means varying staff modes of inter-action with inmates according to the individual inmate orientations toward staff. Thus, the manipulative or aggressive inmate will be met with firm but fair reactions, making violence or fraud unsuccessful; but rewarding legitimate effort. The dependent or neurotic inmate will receive acceptance and ego-support, but with encouragement of self-analysis and self-reliance. Most counseling will not be in formal programs, although these will exist; counseling will occur mainly as it is evoked by problem-revealing events in institutional life, as well as by discussion of the inmates' future plans...counseling will involve primarily the line staff...
>
> ...most efforts at personality influence of staff or inmates will not be considered as ends in themselves, but as means toward achievement of...evoking identification of offenders with anti-criminal persons - such as staff - and increasing inmate capacity for success in maintaining satisfactory personal relationships with anti-criminal persons, in legitimate employment and other pursuits after

2(a)

> release. The major focus in inmate-staff relationships, therefore, will be the staff's contribution to the inmate's development of a conception of himself as opposed to crime, and accepted and successful in a non-criminal life.[6]

It is probable that a community social restoration center cannot be financed on a purely local basis. In order to provide the services envisioned, several counties or communities might join to create the economic and population base for a regional facility. However, it should be located in a predominantly urban setting to provide the opportunity for work experiences and access to the multiple social services and community supports which are necessary. In addition, training and recruitment of superior personnel will be helped by such a location, particularly if a local university can be involved.

Implications for Further Research

Many implications for research and action can be gleaned from the RYT experience and the suggestion that jails be changed to community social restoration centers. Several suggestions have been made in context throughout this report. Some of these, however, seem more urgent and important than others.

For example, although RYT has provided some very useful information about the nature of the population in jail, there is a serious need for further studies in many jails to reveal the physical, psychological, social, cultural values and behavior systems represented by inmates in jail.

---

[6] Glaser, Daniel "The Prison of the Future" in The Future of Imprisonment in a Free Society, Key Issues, Vol. 2, 1965, pp. 44-45.

The basic concepts of RYT also should be tested in other settings and with different work programs. While compensatory education and social mobility in certain work roles have been demonstrated to have practical utility in New York City, it may be necessary to develop somewhat varied applications in smaller communities.

The relationship between the jail and the family of social agencies in the community is a critical feature of a social restoration program. The jail has been isolated heretofore. Detailed information is needed about how to go about developing a truly effective reciprocal interaction.

A whole cluster of variables associated with motivation and the bases for job choices in this population require careful study. The relationships between aspiration, motivation, counseling, job development and effective job placement in relation to various offender, personality and social types should be explored, separately and in combination.

The RYT experience with blanket bonding restrictions suggests that an experiment should be set up to measure the extent to which various types of offenders really are the economic risk that is assumed in current practice.

Some of the young offenders in jail are so handicapped that a brief period of training will not enable them to compete successfully in the current economics of the labor market. Employers cannot afford to carry them for the extended period of time required to bring them to an efficient level of productivity. However, there is some evidence in the RYT study that many of these young men could make the grade if a longer period of breaking-in was allowed. Perhaps government agencies interested in such problems might undertake partially to underwrite an extended period of on-the-job training as a kind of shared risk with employers. It might be a way of providing an "apprenticeship" for these young men in occupations where current economics would otherwise eliminate them from consideration.

The RYT data and experience show that employability, social mobility and job success of young men entering the labor market from jail are significantly affected by training and supportive services. In addition, recidivism was reduced in those segments of the population with the greatest potential for returning to crime. In view of national concerns for preventing crime, the Federal Government should take steps to expand its research activities with regard to the training and employment needs of young offenders.

The RYT program had to develop a pattern of service, and avenues of public and private agency cooperation, including relationships with the employer community with no meaningful support from any governmental agencies. At both national and local levels there is need for the development of an agency with specific responsibility for the employment problems of young offenders.

A broad national policy should be developed to direct implementation of programs for the training and placement of offenders. Major responsibility for the coordination and stimulation of such programs should be vested in a single agency.

A delinquent has been defined as "...an individual who, in his overt revolt against customs and laws, reflects their inadequacies for present-day living; to study the delinquent and his culture is to disclose out-moded laws and decadent institutions". [7] The wisdom of this observation is underlined by the RYT experience. Elements of growth and potential resolution of some problems also have been suggested by this analysis of that experience, but one massive impression remains: the time for the kind of change suggested by RYT is long overdue.

---

[7] Wickham, Winfield M. "Fundamental Statements in Juvenile Delinquency" Alamida County Probation Office, Oakland, California (mimeo)

Appendix A

The following forms were used to gather information reported in the body of the report:

Intake Record Sheet, Pages 252 through 254

RYT Project - IBM Training Instructor's Evaluation, Page 255

Practice Employment Application Form, Pages 256 through 259

Job Order and Placement Record, Page 260

Trainee Follow-Up Interview, Pages 261 through 266

Patient Interview Form, Pages 266 through 271

Parent Interview Forms (Follow-up), Pages 272 through 284

Control Follow-Up Check-List, Pages 285 through 288

Questionnaire on Why RYT Trainees Fail in the Community, Pages 289 through 291

Change in Occupation Status & Termination, Page 292

Final Employer Evaluation and Follow-Up, Page 293

Employment Interview, Pages 294 through 302

Demographic Data (Reception Interview), Pages 303 & 304

Demographic Data, Pages 305 through 308

Intake Record Sheet

R.Y.T. Project

1. Name ______________________ Sentence No. ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ Project No. ☐☐☐

2. Home Address ______________________ Area Code ☐☐☐

3. Date of Birth ☐☐ Mo. ☐☐ Day ☐☐ Yr. Age at Admission to Institution ☐☐

4. Sex ☐ 5) Race 1) W 2) N 3) PR 4) Other

Correction and Prior Offense Data

6. Present offense or offenses ______________________

7. Sentence ______________________

8. Prior offenses - Number ☐ - Offenses ______________________

9. Prior Sentences - Number ☐ - Time Served ______________________

10. Juvenile offenses adjudicated - Number ☐ - Type ______________________

11. Juvenile offenses - Non - Adjudicated - (include J.A.B.)
Number ☐ Type ______________________

12. Total Time - Sentences ______________________

13. Total Time - Probations ______________________

5

Social Background Data

14. Living Arrangement of Trainees

In Own Home

☐ (1) with both parents
☐ (2) with Mother and Father Surrogate
☐ (3) with Father and Mother Surrogate
☐ (4) with Mother only
☐ (5) with Father only

☐ (6) In home of Relatives
☐ (7) In Foster Home family
☐ (8) In Institution
☐ (9) In Independent Living Arrangements
(10) In other place (Specify)______________________________

15. Marital Status of Natural Parents

☐ (1) Parents married and living together

One or Both Parents Dead

☐ (2) Both dead
☐ (3) Father dead
☐ (4) Mother dead

Parents Separated

☐ (5) Divorced or Legally Separated
☐ (6) Father deserted Mother
☐ (7) Mother deserted Father
☐ (8) Other reason - Specify______________________________

☐ (9) Parents not legally married
☐ (10) Other Status - Specify______________________________

16. Regular Occupational Status of Family Members

(1) Father(Guardian)____________________________________
(2) Mother(Guardian)____________________________________
(3) Sibling____
(4) Trainee________________(If work history is indicated, fill out trainee employment data form)

17. Family Income - Source

Other (Specify)______	Father	Mother	Sibling (s)
☐ Earnings	☐	☐	☐
☐ Dept. of Welfare	☐	☐	☐

(267)

Family Income - Source (Con't)	Father	Mother	Sibling (s)	Other
OASI	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other Pension	☐	☐	☐	☐

18. **Total Earnings from all Sources $____________________**
(Monthly)

RYT Project - IBM Training Instructor's Evaluation

Name____Date__________________

I.B.M. Aptitude Test Score __________________

Score Interpretation:

15 - 25 Below Average
25 - 29 Average
30 - 39 Above average
40 - 52 Exceptional

Training-Course Scores: Range: (0 - 100)

1. Basic Machine Operation ____________*
2. Principles of Wiring ____________*
3. #402 Machine Operation ____________*
4. Final Grade ____________**

Top Score = 100 *-based on standard scores(male applicants), NY I.B.M. Training Center
** " " R.Y.T. evaluation and instructor's (IBM) rating

Work Habits and Attitudes	Good	Adequate	Poor
1. Participation in Work Routine			
2. Personal Habits			
3. Personal Appearance			

Comments:

RESTORATION OF YOUTH THROUGH TRAINING

PRACTICE EMPLOYMENT APPLICATION FORM

______________________________ Social Security No. __________
Last Name First Initial

Address ______________________________ Apt. No. ________
Street City

Telephone ____________ Height ____ ft. ____ in. Weight ______ lbs.

Birth date ____________ Marital status ________ No. of dependents ______

Draft status ____________ Have you ever been in the Armed Forces? ________

Branch of service ____________ Rank ________ Serial No. ________

Your duties ______________________________

Type of discharge ______________________________

Date of service: From ________________ To ________________

Have you ever been arrested? ____________ What were the charges? ________

____

Disposition of case ______________________________

Education and Training	Grade School	High School	College
Circle highest grade completed	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

High Schools and Colleges Name and address	Course or major	Did you graduate	Degree	Years of Attendance

EMPLOYMENT APPLICATION - PAGE 2

Professional or Technical Schools

Names and Addresses ____________________

____

____

____

Foreign Languages	Read?	Write?	Speak?

272

Expires: June 30, 1965

MT 206

EMPLOYMENT APPLICATION - PAGE 3

Work History

What kinds of skills do you have? ______________________

In what skill have you had the most experience? ______________________

What kind of work are you applying for? ______________________

____

Experience: List your last job first, then your other jobs.

1. Name of firm ______________________

Address ______________________

Kind of business ______________________ Name of Supervisor ______________________

Describe the work you did ______________________

____

Reason for leaving ______________________

Dates of employment:

From: ________ month ________ year To: ________ month ________ year

Rate of pay

Start ________

When you left

____

2. Name of firm ______________________

Address ______________________

Kind of business ______________________ Name of Supervisor ______________________

Describe the work you did ______________________

____

Reason for leaving ______________________

Dates of employment:

From: ________ month ________ year To: ________ month ________ year

Rate of pa

Start ________

When left ________

EMPLOYMENT APPLICATION - PAGE 4

3. Name of firm ______________________________

Address of business ____________________ Name of Supervisor ____________

Kind of business ______________________________

Describe the work you did ______________________________

____

Reason for leaving ______________________________

Dates of employment:

From: ______ month ______ year To: ______ month ______ year

Rate of pay

Start ______

When you left ______

List and explain any gaps in employment:

____

____

____

____

Give at least three personal references (not relatives)

Name Address Occupation

1. ______________________________

2. ______________________________

3. ______________________________

May we check your references? __________

____

Applicant's Signature

274

JOB ORDER AND PLACEMENT RECORD

Name of Trainee ____________________ Project No. ________

Address ____________________ Group No. ________

Telephone ____________________

Course Grade (IBM) ____________ Completed ____________
month day year

Placed with:

Name of Company ____________________

Address ____________________ Tel. ________

Title of job ____________________

Supervisor ____________________ Title ____________

Date placed ____________________

Salary per week ____________ Hourly rate ____________

Hours per week ____________ From ____________ To ____________ -Dail

Payment date of first salary ____________

Job Status:

1.( ) Full time, Permanent - Probationary Period ends ____________

2.( ) Full time, Temporary - Employment ends ____________

3.( ) Part time - Days or hours per week ____________

Employment reason: Replacement ( ) Addition ( )

Job Specifications:

Education: Grade School complete - yes( ) No ( )
H.S. complete - yes ( ) no ( )

Citizenship: Native USA _____ Naturalized USA _____ Non USA _____

Bonding required: No( ) yes ( ) Amount $ ____________

Machine proficiency in: Key punch _____ Sorter _____ Reproducer _____
Tabulator _____ Collator ___ Other ____________
Specify

Special Qualifications (specify) ____________________

____

____

RYT Placement Form #1

BOB No. 44-6336
Expires June 30, 1965

RESTORATION OF YOUTH THROUGH TRAINING PROJECT

Cyp. TRAINEE FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW

Name ______________________________ Cycle No. __________

Address ______________________________ Phone No. __________

Follow-Up Date:

1. __________ 3. __________
2. __________ 4. __________
5. __________

---

1. (a) What has happened to you since you left Rikers Island (or were interviewed by RYT the last time)? Probe chronological sequence.

   (b) What has happened to "shake you up the most"?

2. How do you feel about the way things have been going for you?

   Why?

3. (a) What jobs have you held since you left Rikers Island (or were interviewed by RYT the last time)? Start with most recent job:

   (I) Name of firm ____________________ Supervisor __________
   Address ____________________ Phone No. __________
   Type of Company ____________________ Job Title __________
   Dates of Employment: From _____ To _____ Salary $ __________

Type of Termination ____________ Reason ____________
(fired, quit, etc.)

What did you like most about this job ____________

What did you like least about this job ____________

(II) Name of Firm ____________ Supervisor ____________

Address ____________ Phone No. ____________

Type of Company ____________ Job Title ____________

Dates of Employment: From ____ To ____ Salary $ ____________

Type of Termination ____________ Reason ____________
(Fired, Quit, Etc.)

What did you like most about this job ____________

What did you like least about this job ____________

(III) Name of Firm ____________ Supervisor ____________

Address ____________ Phone No. ____________

Type of Company ____________ Job Title ____________

Dates of Employment: From ____ To ____ Salary $ ____________

Type of Termination ____________ Reason ____________
(Fired, Quit, Etc.)

What did you like most about this job ____________

What did you like least about this job ____________

(b) Do you feel you have done well or poorly in terms of the type of jobs you have had?

(c) Why do you say this?

(d) In your opinion, how does your present (most recent) job supervisor feel about you?

(e) Why do you say this?

4. (a) What kind of a job would you like to have? Salary (per week)?

(b) What do you think of your chances of getting it? (Excellent, good, fair, poor, very poor).

(c) What are you doing to get this job? (i.e., special training, more education, etc.).

5. Were you placed in IBM right away (in a short time) after you left Rikers Island? (Analyze circumstances)

6. (If no, ask): How did you feel about not getting placed in IBM and having to work at another kind of job? (Probe for basis of feelings).

7. (If not placed at all, ask): How did you feel about not getting a job from RYT? (Probe)

8. After you left Rikers Island, did you ever feel like not wanting to work or discontinuing after you started?

(a) What caused you to feel this way?

(b) What changed your mind?

9. (a) What did you enjoy doing in your spare time before going to Rikers Island?

(278)

(b) What do you enjoy doing now in your spare time?

(c) Have you ever belong to any clubs, organizations, etc.?

(If not, why not?)

Which ones? (How long - in months):

1. ____________ ( )   3. ____________ ( )
2. ____________ ( )   4. ____________ ( )
5. ____________ ( )

(d) Are you still a member of any of these clubs? Why?

10. (a) Do you have any friends? (If none, why not?)

(b) How long have you known them?

(c) Why do you consider them friends?

(d) How often do you see them each week?

11. (a) Have any of your friends gotten into trouble?

What kind?

12. Describe your friends' chances of staying out of trouble:

13. (a) How long have you lived in your present neighborhood?

(b) (If moved): What was purpose of move?

(c) How do you feel you are getting along there?

14. (a) Have there been, or are there now, any problems with parole?

What are they?

(b) How do you get along with your parole officer?

(c) Why do you say this? Give me some examples:

(d) How does your parole officer feel about you? (Your opinion).

15. (a) Have you had any chances to get into trouble?

(b) What did you do? Why?

16. (a) What do you think your chances are of staying out of trouble in the future?

(b) Why do you say this?

17. (a) With whom do you reside?

(b) With whom do you talk about your problems?

Why?

(c) How does your family feel about you? (Your opinion):

Is there anyone with whom you do not get along?

18. (a) How has the RYT Program helped you?

(b) If not, why not?

(c) What should have been different?

19. What promises were made to you by the RYT Project that were not fulfilled:	(Indicate start, middle or end of Training Cycle)
(1)________________________________	________________
(2)________________________________	________________
(3)________________________________	________________
(4)________________________________	________________
(5)________________________________	________________

BOB No. 44-6336
Expires: June 30, 1965
MT 206 - N

RESTORATION OF YOUTH THROUGH TRAINING PROJECT
PARENT INTERVIEW FORM

Name: ______________________________ I.D. # ______________

1. What is your maiden name?

2. Where were you born?

3. Where was your son born?

4. How old was he when the family came to New York City?

5. What schools did he attend?

6. a) How far did he go in school?

   b) (If he didn't finish) Did he drop out?

   c) Could you tell me why he dropped out?

7. Did he have trouble in school?

   What kind of trouble?

8. How do you feel about his dropping out?

9. Does he have any desire or plans to return to school?

10. Did you talk to him about returning to school?

Do you feel that your talking to him helped in his plans to return to school?

11. How do you feel about his returning to school?

12. What was the highest grade you completed in school?

How much education would you like to see your son get?

13. a. Did you feel the same way before your son entered the R.Y.T. Program?

b. If no, how did you feel about the amount of education he should have?

14. a. Has he ever attended a special school or received special training for the purpose of learning a skill?

b. What skill?

c. Does he hold any special licenses?

15. What kind of work did ____________ do before coming to Riker's Island?
(list jobs or regular line of work)

16. How much salary did he average __________ per week; __________ per month;

____________ or per year?

17. Did he have any periods of unemployment or idleness?

18. About how long?

How often?

19. a. Did he have difficulty in finding a job?

b. Could you tell me why?

20. What kind of work does your son do now?

21. How do you feel about this type of work? Is this the type of work you always wanted for your son?

22. If not, what type of job did you want for him?

23. What problems did he have before coming to Riker's Island?

24. What problems does he have now?

25. How does he get along at home with the other members of the family?

26. When he worked, did he help out at home financially?

27. What does he do in his spare time?

28. Who works in your family? What do they do?

29. Is this their and your regular line of work?

30. Are you presently on Welfare? How long?

31. Have you ever been on Welfare? How long?

32. Are there any other suggestions or comments you would like to make regarding the program?

PARENT INTERVIEW FORMS (FOLLOW-UP)

RESTORATION of YOUTH through TRAINING PROGRAM

COLUMN and CODE ASSIGNMENTS

Column

1. ____ Trainee's Permanent I.D. No.: ______________
2. ____
3. ____
4. ____
5. ____
6. ____
7. ____

8. ____ Date of this Rating: (Ex. July 1, 1964 - 07/01/4)
9. ____
10. ____
11. ____
12. ____

13. ____ Rating Sequence

1) First Follow-Up
2) Second Follow-Up
3) Third Follow-Up
4) Fourth Follow-Up
5) Fifth Follow-Up

Column

14. ___ **Relationship to Respondent to Trainee**

1) Father
2) Mother
3) Grandmother
4) Other Relative
5) Guardian
6) Foster Parent
7) Stepfather
8) Stepmother
9) Other (specify):__________

15. ___ **Birthplace of Respondent**

1) Same city as present residence (N.Y.C.)
2) Northeast States (New Eng.; N.J.; Pa.; N.Y., excluding N.Y.C.)
3) Southern States
4) U.S., other than Northeast or Southern'
5) Puerto Rico
6) Europe
7) Other (specify):__________

16. ___ **Birthplace of Trainee** (same as above)

1) N.Y.C.
2) Northeast
3) Southern
4) U.S., other than Northeast or Southern
5) Puerto Rico
6) Europe
7) Other (specify):__________

17. ___ **Trainee's Age when Family Came to New York City**

0) Doesn't apply -- trainee doesn't live in N.Y.C.
1) Under 6, or born here.
2) 7 - 11
3) 12 - 14
4) 15 - 17
5) 18 - 20, and over
6) Not obtained

Column

18. ____ **Highest Grade Completed by Trainee**

1) 6th grade and under
2) 7th grade - 9th grade
3) 10th grade
4) 11th grade
5) 12th grade (didn't receive H.S. Diploma)
6) 12th grade (received diploma)
7) Some college
8) College graduate
9) Other (specify):__________

19. ____ **Current School Status**

0) Trainee still attending high school
1) Trainee graduated high school
2) Trainee did not finish high school
3) Trainee did not finish elementary school
4) Trainee has some college
5) Trainee completed college

20. ____ **Reason Trainee Did Not Finish School**

0) Joined Army
1) Went to work
2) Over legal age
3) Influenced by friends
4) Was arrested and imprisoned
5) Lack of money
6) Lack of interest
7) Family problems
8) Expelled
9) Other (specify):__________

Column

21. ___ **Whether Trainee had Serious Trouble in School**

1) None
2) A little (not serious)
3) Serious
4) Very serious
5) Don't know
6) Other (specify):__________

22. ___ **Type of Trouble Trainee Had in School**

1) Truancy
2) Disruptive behavior in classroom (clowning, annoying teacher, fights, making noise)
3) Truancy and poor grades
4) Truancy and disruptive behavior
5) Poor grades and disruptive behavior
6) Truancy, poor grades and disruptive behavior
7) Didn't like school or supervision
8) Other (specify):__________
9) Not obtained

23. ___ **Perceived Parent's or Surrogate's Concern About Trainee Dropping out of School**

1) Doesn't apply - trainee still attending school or had graduated
2) Happy over drop-out
3) Preferred that trainee drop-out of school
4) Ambivalent feelings about
5) Neutral - no feeling one way or the other
6) Had some concern
7) Extremely upset about drop-out.
8) No opinion
9) Other (specify):__________

24. ____ Whether Trainee Desires or Plans to Return to School

0) Trainee still attending school
1) Trainee has graduated
2) Yes
3) No
4) Respondent not sure
5) Other (specify):__________

25. ____ Parent's Feeling about Trainee Returning to School

0) Trainee graduated
1) Strongly favorable toward return to school
2) Essentially favorable toward return to school
3) Ambivalent: sometimes seems favorable, sometimes seems opposed to return to school.
4) Neutral: no feeling one way or the other (let him do what he wants to do)
5) Essentially unfavorable (negative) attitude toward return to school
6) Extremely unfavorable (negative) attitude toward return to school
7) Other (specify):__________

26. ____ Highest Grade Completed by Parent or Parent-Surrogate

0) None
1) Some grammar school
2) Graduated grammar school
3) Some high school
4) High school graduate
5) Some college
6) College graduate
7) Some post-graduate
8) Other (specify):__________

27. ____ Amount of Education Parent or Surrogate Would Like Trainee to Get

0) Parent satisfied with present level
1) Finish elementary school
2) Finish some high school - at least 2 years
3) Finish high school
4) Attend trade school
5) Some college
6) Finish college
7) More than college (post graduate work)
8) Neutral: no opinion one way or other
9) Not obtained

Column

28. ___ **Whether Trainee Ever Attended a Special School or REceived Special Training to Learn a Skill Prior to Enrolling in RYT Program**

0) Yes
1) No
2) Planned to but didn't go
3) Other (specify):________

29. ___ **Type of Skill Learned on Outside Prior to Enrolling in RYT Program** (specify):________________

1) None
2) Professional or semi-professional
3) Managerial
4) Skilled (apprenticeship required)
5) Semi-skilled (requires some special training)
6) Agricultural, Marine or Forestry
7) Clerical
8) Sales
9) Protective or Services

30. ___ **Whether Trainee Holds any Special Licenses**

0) Yes (specify):________
1) No
2) Planned to get a special license but didn't
3) Other (specify):________

31. ___ **Type of Work Trainee Did on Outside Prior to Entering RYT Program**

0) None, or never employed
1) Not eligible for labor force.
2) Professional or semi-professional
3) Managerial
4) Agricultural, Marine or Forestry
5) Clerical
6) Sales
7) Protective or Services

32. ___ **Type of Work (continued)**

0) Skilled (apprenticeship required
1) Semi-skilled (requires some special training)
2) Part-time skilled
3) Unskilled
4) Part-time unskilled
5) Other (specify):________

Column

33. ___ **Amount of (Gross) Salary Trainee Averaged Per Week on Regular Job Held Before Coming to Rikers Island**

0) Doesn't apply - had no work history prior to entering RYT Program
1) Less than $30 per week
2) $30, but less than $40
3) $40, but less than $50
4) $50, but less than $60
5) $60, but less than $70
6) $70, but less than $80
7) $80, but less than $90
8) Over $90 per week
9) Not obtained

34. ___ **Whether Trainee Had Any Periods of Unemployment or Idleness While Working Before Coming to Rikers Island**

0) Doesn't apply - had no work history prior to entering RYT Program
1) Yes
2) No
3) Other (specify):___________

35. ___ **Length of Unemployment (Idleness) Periods**

0) Doesn't apply - had no periods of unemployment after beginning work
1) Parent doesn't know
2) 1 to 3 weeks
3) 3 to 5 weeks
4) 5 to 8 weeks
5) 8 to 12 weeks
6) 12 to 16 weeks
7) 16 to 20 weeks
8) 20 weeks or more
9) Never worked

36. ___ **Frequency of Unemployment Periods Since Beginning Work**

0) Doesn't apply - had no unemployment periods after beginning work
1) 1 time only
2) 2 to 4 times
3) 4 to 8 times
4) 8 to 12 times
5) 12 or more times
6) Other (specify):___________
7) Doesn't apply - never worked
8) Not obtained

Column

37. ____ **Whether Trainee Had Difficulty in Finding Jobs Before Entering RYT Program**

0) Doesn't apply - had no work history prior to entering RYT Program
1) Parent doesn't know
2) Yes
3) No
4) Other (specify): __________

38. ____ **Reason for Trainee's Pre-RYT Difficulties in Job Finding**

0) Doesn't apply - had no difficulty in finding jobs
1) Doesn't apply - never worked
2) Too young
3) Lacked education
4) Did not actively seek a job
5) Lacked experience and skills
6) Improperly dressed when looking for job
7) Jobs too far away from home
8) Combination of education, skills and experience
9) Parent doesn't know if trainee had difficulties

39. ____ **Type of Work Trainee Was Doing at Time of Interview**

0) Never employed
1) Not working at this time
2) In jail at this time
3) Professional or semi-professional
4) Managerial
5) Skilled (apprenticeship required)
6) Semi-skilled (some special training
7) Unskilled
8) Agricultural, Marine or Forestry
9) Clerical

40. ____ **Type of Work** (continued)

0) Sales
1) Protective or Services
2) Part-time skilled
3) Part-time unskilled
4) Other (specify): __________
5) Not obtained

Column

41. ____ **How Parent Felt About Type of Work Trainee was Doing at Time of Interview**

0) Doesn't apply - trainee not working at time of interview
1) Doesn't apply - parent satisfied with work trainee was doing
2) Parent dissatisfied with work trainee was doing.
3) Ambivalent
4) Neutral (no opinion)
5) Other (specify):__________

42. ____ **Type of Work Parent Wants for Trainee Instead of Most Recent Job**

0) Parent satisfied with present job
1) Professional or semi-professional
2) Managerial
3) Skilled (apprenticeship required)
4) Semi-skilled (some special training required)
5) Agricultural, Marine or Forestry
6) Clerical
7) Sales
8) Protective or Services
9) No specific goal (whatever he wants)

43. ____ **Parent's Perception of Trainee's Problems Before Entering RYT Program**

0) Parent doesn't know
1) Trainee had no problems
2) Rejected supervision - pleasure oriented
3) Family problems involving siblings and/or in-laws
4) Emotional problems
5) Outside influences (bad companions, etc.)
6) Combination of outside influences and emotional problems.
7) Committed delinquent act.
8) Marital problems
9) Other (specify):__________

44. ____ **Parent's Perception of Trainee's Problems at Time of Interview (Subsequent to Release from Rikers Island)**

0) Parent doesn't know
1) Trainee has no problems
2) Rejects supervision, etc.
3) Family problems (as above)
4) Emotional problems
5) Outside influences, as above
6) Combination of outside influences and emotional problems
7) Commits delinquent acts
8) Marital problems
9) Other (specify):__________

Column

45. ____ How Trainee Gets Along with Other Members of Family

0) Doesn't apply - trainee living away from home
1) Gets along well
2) Parent states "no problems"
3) Erratic (sometimes gets along, sometimes doesn't)
4) Does not get along
5) Not obtained

46. ____ Source(s) of Trainee's Intra-Familial Conflict

0) Doesn't apply - trainee living away from home
1) Doesn't apply - trainee gets along with all in family
2) Siblings (brothers and/or sisters as a whole)
3) Brother(or brothers)
4) Sister (or sisters)
5) Both parents
6) One parent
7) Parents and siblings
8) Not obtained
9) Others (specify):__________

47. ____ Reason for Trainee's Intra-Familial Conflict:

0) Rejects parental supervision
1) Sibling clash
2) Difficulty with in-laws
3) Family friction resulting from trainee getting into trouble
4) Jealousy, not enough attention from family
5) Parent doesn't know
6) Not obtained
7) Other (specify):__________

48. ____ Whether Trainee Helps Out at Home when Working

0) Doesn't apply - never worked
1) Doesn't apply - lives alone
2) Yes
3) Erratic (sometimes helps, sometimes doesn't help)
4) No
5) Other (specify):__________
6) Not obtained

49. ____ Reason Trainee Doesn't Help Out at Home when Working

0) Doesn't apply - trainee has never worked or lives alone
1) Parents don't require trainee to help when working (not even board)
2) Parents wish trainee to buy own clothes, etc. with money
3) Trainee spends money on pleasure (refused to help)
4) Not obtained

Column

50. ____ What Trainee Did in His Spare Time before Entering RYT Program

0) Doesn't apply - don't know trainee lives away from home
1) Leisure time primarily spent in neutral way
2) Leisure time primarily spent in constructive way (e.g., hobbies, organized sports)
3) Leisure time partially constructive, partially neutral (T.V., playing phonograph)
4) Leisure time partially constructive, partially neutral and partially destructive (gangs, fights, etc.)
5) Leisure time partially neutral, partially destructive (drinking)
6) Leisure time primarily destructive (drug use)
7) Not obtained
8) Other (specify):__________

51. ____ Trainee's Use of Spare Time Since Enrolling in RYT Program

0) No change (positive)
1) No change (negative)
2) Changed to more constructive use of leisure time
3) Changed to more neutral use of leisure time.
4) Changed to more destructive use of leisure time
5) Not obtained

52. ____ Who Works in Trainee's Family Besides Trainee

0) Doesn't apply - no one working or worker temporarily unemployed
1) Doesn't apply - no one working, family on full relief, social security or insurance.
2) One parent (or surrogate) only
3) Both parents (or surrogates) only
4) One or more siblings only
5) One parent and one or more siblings
6) Both parents and one or more siblings
7) Any of above in combination with other extended members of family
8) Other (specify):__________
9) Not obtained

53. ____ Type of Jobs Held by Family's Workers

0) Doesn't apply
1) Professional or semi-professional
2) Managerial
3) Skilled (apprenticeship required)
4) Semi-skilled (some special training required)
5) Unskilled
6) Agricultural, Marine or Forestry
7) Clerical
8) Sales
9) Others (specify):__________

Column

54. ___ Type of Jobs Held by Family's Workers (continued)

0) Protective or Services
1) Part-time skilled
2) Part-time unskilled

55. ___ Whether Jobs Held are Family Workers' Regular Occupations

1) Doesn't apply
2) Yes
3) No
4) Other (specify):_________
5) Not obtained

56. ___ Which Parents Were Working at Regular Jobs

1) Doesn't apply
2) Neither parent working at regular job, but working
3) Both parents working at regular jobs
4) Father working regular job, mother not.
5) Mother working regular job, father not
6) Father temporarily laid off, will return to regular work
7) Mother temporarily laid off, will return to regular work
8) Not obtained
9) Other (specify):_________

57. ___ Whether Family Has Ever Been on Welfare or other Public Assistance

0) Yes
1) No
2) Other (specify):_________
3) Impossible to classify
4) Not obtained

58. ___ Whether Family Was on Welfare or Other Public Assistance at Time of Interview

0) Yes
1) No
2) Other (specify):_________
3) Not obtained

59. ___ Length of Time Family Has Been on Relief

0) Doesn't apply
1) Less than 6 months
2) 6 months to less than 1 year
3) 1 year but less than 2 years
4) 2 years but less than 5 years
5) 5 years but less than 10 years
6) 10 years or more
7) Not obtained
8) Other (specify):_________

Column

60. ____ **Rater's Global Impression of Parent's Level of Aspiration for Trainee**

0) High level of aspiration
1) Erratic (inconsistent) level of aspiration: sometimes seems to have a fairly high level, sometimes not
2) Low level of aspiration for trainee
3) No specific or no apparent aspiration for trainee (e.g., Do what he wants, as long as he's happy, etc.)
4) Other (specify): __________
5) Not obtained

61. ____ **Rater's Global Impression of Parent's Control Over Trainee**

0) Doesn't apply - not under jurisdiction of parents (living alone or parents not living in city, etc.
1) Has good control over trainee
2) Erratic (sometimes seems to have control over trainee, sometimes has poor control or no control over trainee
3) Has poor control over trainee
4) Has little or no control over trainee
5) Other (specify): __________
6) Impossible to classify
7) Not obtained

62. ____ **Parental Knowledge of Trainee's Whereabouts**

0) Doesn't apply - not under jurisdiction of parents (living alone or parents not living in city, etc.
1) Usually know trainee's whereabouts
2) Erratic (sometimes know trainee's whereabouts, sometimes not)
3) Usually have no knowledge of trainee's whereabouts
4) Rarely or never have knowledge of trainee's whereabouts
5) Unable to classify
6) Not obtained
7) Other (specify): __________

RESTORATION of YOUTH through TRAINING PROJECT

CONTROL FOLLOW-UP CHECK-LIST

Date of Interview ______________

COLUMN

I.D. No. Last Name ______________ First Name ______________

1. _____ Home Address ______________ Phone No. ______________

2. _____ Change Address ______________ Phone No. ______________

3. _____ (1) Cycle ______________ (2, 3) No. ______________

Sentence Number ______________ Date Released ______________

Follow-up Date

1. ______________
2. ______________
3. ______________
4. ______________
5. ______________

Job Type

4. _____ (4) Current Job Type ______________ (Specify)

(0) None or never employed
(1) Not eligible for labor force
(2) Professional or semi-professional
(3) Managerial
(4) Agriculture, Marine or Forestry
(5) Clerical
(6) Sales
(7) Protective or Custody
(8) Service

Job Type

5. _____ (5) Current Job Type

(0) Skilled apprenticeship required
(1) Semi-skilled (requires some special training)
(2) Part-time skilled
(3) Unskilled
(4) Part-time unskilled
(5) Other (Specify) ______________
(9) Not Obtained

COLUMN

[illegible]. _____ (6) Current Salary (Weekly gross)

(0) Does not apply-unemployed or part-time

(1) Less than $30 per week
(2) $30, but less than $40
(3) $40, but less than $50
(4) $50, but less than $60
(5) $60, but less than $70
(6) $70, but less than $80
(7) $80, but less than $90
(8) Over $90 per week
(9) Not obtained

No. of
Jobs

7. _____ (7) Number of Jobs Held Since Last Follow-up

(0) None (1) One (2) Two (3) Three (4) Four
(5) Five (6) Six (7) Seven or more
(9) Not Obtained

Reason
Terminated

8. _____ (8) Reason for Job Termination ______________________
(Specify)

(0) N.A.-Never worked
(1) N.A.-Never unemployed
(2) Quit
(3) Fired
(4) Laid-off
(5) Other
(9) Not Obtained

Unemployment
Period

9. _____ (9) Longest Period of Unemployment Since Last Interview

(0)N.A.-Never worked
(1) N.A.-Never unemployed
(2) Less than one week
(3) One week, less than four weeks
(4) One month, less than two
(5) Two months, less than three
(6) Three months, less than six
(7) Other: ______________________
(Specify)
(9) Not Obtained

Current Marital
Status

10._____ (10) Current Marital Status

(0) Single
(1) Married
(2) Separated
(3) Divorced
(4) Annuled
(5) Became legal father
(6) Became illegal father
(7) Other: ______________________
(Specify)
(9) Not Obtained

COLUMN

School Status

11.____ (11) Current School Status

(0) Not attending school
(1) Attending Academic school
(2) Attending Technical or Trade school
(3) Returned to school and dropped out
(4) Finished Technical or trade school
(5) Finished Academic school
(6) Currently pursuing advanced education
(7) Other ________________ (Specify

(9) Not Obtained

Parole Status

12.____ (12)
(0) Has successfully completed parole
(1) Is successfully completing parole
(2) Is doing poorly on parole
(3) Has returned to the Institution for new offense
(4) Returned to Institution for V.O.P.
(5) Is currently awaiting disposition
(6) Other: ________________ (Specify)

(9) Not Obtained

Living Arrangements

13.____ (13) Current Living Arrangements

(0) Living alone
(1) Living with spouse
(2) Living with mother
(3) Living with father or both parents
(4) With parent surrogate (relative)
(5) With guardian
(6) With friend
(7) Other: ________________ (Specify)

(9) Not Obtained

No. of Arrests

14.____ (14) Total Number of Arrests Since Last Follow-up. (Specify nature of arrest)

(0) None
(1) ________________
(2) ________________
(3) ________________
(4) ________________
(5) ________________
(6) ________________
(7) ________________

(9) Not Obtained ________________

COLUMN

No. Convictions

15._____ (15) Total Number of Convictions (Specify nature of conviction)

(0) ____None____ (2) __________ (4)__________

(1) __________ (3) __________ (9) Not Obtained

Time in the
Community

16._____ (16) Length of Time in the Community Before Returned to the Institution(Since Last Follow-up).

(0) Not applicable
(1) Less than one week
(2) One week, less than two weeks
(3) Two weeks, less than four weeks
(4) Four weeks, less than two months
(5) Two months, less than three months
(6) Three months, less than four months
(7) Four months, less than five months
(8) Five months or more
(9) Not Obtained

Date returned to the Institution______________
(if applicable)

Date re-released from the Institution______________
(if applicable)

Date of second return to the Institution______________
(if applicable)

BOB No. 44-6336
Expires June 30, 1965
MT 206 -0

"QUESTIONNAIRE ON WHY R. Y. T. TRAINEES FAIL IN THE COMMUNITY":

Name________________________________ I.D.#____________

1. Tell me what happened to you since you left Rikers Island up to the time you came back. (Use back of sheet)

2. Why do you think you got into trouble again?

    a) Whose fault do you think it was?

    b) Do you think anything could have been done to prevent it?

        I) If no, why not?

        II) If yes, what?

    c) When you left Rikers Island did you think you were going to succeed or not?

        I) If no, why not?

        II) If yes, why?

    d) When you left Rikers Island, did you think you were almost sure to come back to prison.

        I) If no, why not?

        II) If yes, why?

7. Did you feel confident about getting a decent job prior to entering the program?

8. Did you have any idea of working in this particular field before you entered the program?

9. Did you ever ask about or try to get this kind of training or a similar type of training before you entered the program?

10. Did this program open your eyes to areas of work which you had never thought of as possible occupations?

11. What did your family think about your being in the program?

12. Did they encourage you to work hard and study hard?

13. Did they say that they would like you to work in the I.B.M. area?

14. Did your family think that you were improving yourself?

15. Are they encouraging you to take up this line of work?

(b) What do you think could have been done to prevent it?

(c) Why do you say this? Why not?

5. Do you think the RYT Project could have helped you to stay out of trouble more than they did or do you think they did all they could?

Why do you say this?

(a) What could they have done more than they did do?

(b) Do you think the Project should be responsible for helping the trainees to stay out of trouble or is it mostly up to them?

6. If you had it to do over again, what would you do differently than you did this time while you were out?

Why? Why not?

CHANGE IN OCCUPATION STATUS & TERMINATION

Name____Project No._____

Address____

Employer____

Address____

Job Title____

Employee status changed, but not terminated:

1.( ) Transferred, Promotion (Form #__________attached)

2.( ) Transferred, Demotion (Form #__________attached)
  a. ( )Personal
  b. ( )Disability
  c. ( )Did not meet performance standard_______________
  specify

Employee terminated (check appropriate items)

1.( ) Wages

2.( ) Opportunity elsewhere

3 ( ) Working conditions

4.( ) Personal

5.( ) Health

( ) Unsatisfactory work

7.( ) Business conditions - laid off

8.( ) Unsatisfactory attendance

9.( ) Unsatisfactory conduct

10.( ) Military Service

11.( ) Other_________________________
  specify

Remarks____

____

____

NYT Placement Form #3

FINAL EMPLOYER EVALUATION and FOLLOW-UP

Employer ______________________ Date ____________

Address ______________________

Total Number of Employees ______ Number of Employees in EAM Operation ____

We plan to convert to EDP: Yes ( ) No ( )

If yes, how soon? ______________________

Name of Trainee ______________________ Project Number ____________

Address ______________________ Telephone Number ____________

Job Title ______________________ Salary ____________

Date Hired ______________________

Current Status ______________________

JOB PERFORMANCE RATING

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
Attendance				
Punctuality				
Cooperation with other employees				
Cooperation with supervisors				
Ability to master job requirements. (Please elaborate in "Remarks")				
Personal appearance				

Number of days absent ______ Number of days late ______

Remarks: ______________________

BOB No. 44-6336
Expires: June 30, 1965

MT 206 - K

EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEW

NAME ____
Last First M.I.

(1-2) Card # 06

(3-5) RYT # _____

(6-11) Correction # _________

(12) Type of Organization

(1) National
(2) Regional
(3) State
(4) Local

(13) Type of Activity

(1) Manufacturing
(2) Whole. & Retail Trading
(3) Trans. & Public Utilit.
(4) Finance, Ins. Real Est.
(5) Hospital, Social Svce.
(6) Services
(7) Construction
(8) Civil Service
(9) Other

(14) Number of Employees in Org.

(1) Under 100
(2) 100-500
(3) 500-1000
(4) Over 1000

(15) Number of Employees in EDP

(1) Under 10
(2) 10-50
(3) 50-100
(4) Over 100

(16) Description of Work

(1) Proprietor
(2) Management (Executive)
(3) Personnel
(4) Middle-Management (foreman)
(5) Immediate Supervisor
(6) Other

(19) Description of Job Traine
Hired For

(1) Laborer
(2) Operator
(3) Services Incl. Domes.
(4) Clerical
(5) Sales
(6) Crafts
(7) Manager
(8) Technical
(9) Other

(20) Class. of Job Hired For

(1) Blue Collar
(2) White Collar
(3) Services

Requirements of Specific Job:

(21) Desire or Willingness t Wo

(1) Yes
(2) No

(22) Ambition & Initiative

(1) Yes
(2) No

(23) Specific Basic Skills At
Entry Level

(1) Yes
(2) No

(24) Sense of Responsibility
& Stability

(1) Yes
(2) No

(25) Able to Get Along Well
With People

(1) Yes
(2) No

(1) Parole Commission
(2) RYT Job Developer
(3) NYSES
(4) Private Employ. Agency
(5) Dept. of Correction
(6) Boy's Family or Relative
(7) Boy's Friend
(8) Self-Referral
(9) Other

(18) Mode of Contact

(1) Telephone Alone
(2) Mail Alone
(3) Telephone & Mail
(4) Tele.,Mail & J.D.Visit
(5) Tele. & Job. Dev.Visit
(6) Mail & Job Dev. Visit
(7) Job Developer Visit Alone
(8) Other

(26) Fair Level of Education

(1) Yes
(2) No

(27) Mental Alertness

(1) Yes
(2) No

(28) Good Appearance

(1) Yes
(2) No

(29) Physical Ability for Job

(1) Yes
(2) No

Skills Needed Before Entering Job

(30) Literacy

(1) Yes
(2) No

(31) Ability to Drive Car

(1) Yes
(2) No

(32) Clerical

(1) Yes
(2) No

(33) Good Response to People (Meeting The Public)

(1) Yes
(2) No

(34) Follow Instructions

(1) Yes
(2) No

(35) Mechanical

(1) Yes
(2) No

(43) Why Did You Decide to Hire This Young Man?

(1) Sense of Civic Resp.
(2) Induced by RYT J.D.
(3) Shortage of Help
(4) Qualified by Training For the Job
(5) Applicant Sold Himself as Worthwhile
(6) Influenced by Friends or Relatives

(44) Was IBM Training He Had Received an Influencing Factor?

(1) Yes
(2) No

(45) Did you Fill An Existing Job Opening?

(1) Yes
(2) No

(46) Did You Develop an Opening for Job

(1) Yes
(2) No

(36) Arithmetic

(1) Yes
(2) No

(37) Verbal Abilities

(1) Yes
(2) No

(38) Other Specific Skills

(1) Yes
(2) No

(39) What Skills May Be Acquired on Job?

(1) Mechanical
(2) Clerical
(3) Verbal
(4) Arithmetic
(5) Craft
(6) Formal Body of Knowledge
(7) Meeting the Public
(8) Other

(40) Do you have a "breaking-in" period?

(1) Yes
(2) No

(41) After person has been on job long enough to learn, is supervision

(1) General
(2) Close
(3) None at All

(42) Was (Is) Immediate Supervisor

(1) Male
(2) Female

(47) How Did Employment of This Youth Affect Your Public Image?

(1) Helped
(2) Hindered
(3) Didn't Affect It One Way or the Other

(48) How Did the Employment of This Youth Affect Other People in Your Org.?

(1) Positively
(2) Negatively
(3) Indifferently

Do You Have A Policy in Your Org. That Applies to Hiring Such Young Men?

(49) Specific Regulatory Policy For:

(1) Yes
(2) No

(50) Specific Regulatory Policy Against:

(1) Yes
(2) No

(51) Trying to Establish Policy For Or Against

(1) Yes
(2) No

(52) Must Be Bondable

(1) Yes
(2) No

When You First Met This Candicate, How Did He Compare With the Average Candidate for the Same Job In:

(53) Skills

1) Higher
2) Same
3) Lower

(54) Education

1) Higher
2) Same
3) Lower

(55) Speech

1) Higher
2) Same
3) Lower

(56) Appearance

1) Higher
2) Same
3) Lower

When You First Saw Him, Did You Feel He Would Have Difficulty Or No Difficulty With Regard To:

(57) Routine Demands of Work

1) Difficulty
2) No Difficulty
3) Don't Know or Remember

(58) Attitudes Toward Work

1) Difficulty
2) No Difficulty
3) Don't Know or Remember

(59) Attitudes Toward Supervision

1) Difficulty
2) No Difficulty
3) Don't know or Remember

(60) Getting Along With Other Workers

1) Difficulty
2) No Difficulty
3) Don't Know or Remember

(63) In What Way Was Training Unrelated to His Work

1) Not applicable
2) IBM Machines Obsolete
3) Work Completely unrelated to IBM training

(64) At time of hiring, was the job this man was hired to do

1) full time-permanent
2) full time-temporary
3) part time-permanent
4) part time-temporary

(65) If hired part-time temporary was it seasonal?

1) Not applicable
2) Yes
3) No

(66) What is Base Pay?

1) Under $20 per week
2) $21-40 per week
3) $41-60 per week
4) $61-80 per week
5) $81-100 per week
6) $101-120 per week
7) $121-140 per week
8) $141-160 per week
9) Over $161 per week

(67) What is Average Number of Hours Per Week

1) Less than 40
2) 40
3) More than 40

(68) Is there Overtime?

1) Yes
2) No
3) Sometimes

(70) How is Overtime Managed

1) Not Applicable
2) Compensatory Time
3) Extra Pay
4) Vacation Time
5) No Compensation in time or money

(61) Was The IBM Training He Had Received Related to The Work He Was Hired To Do

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not Applicable

(62) In What Way Was Training Related to His Work

(1) Not Applicable
(2) Training Related to Possible Work
(3) Hired for IBM Knowledge

(71) How Many Jobs Are There like This One in the Company

7

(1) Only one
(2) 2-5
(3) More than Five

(72) What is Turnover In This Job?

(1) Rapid Rate
(2) Slow Rate
(3) Moderate Rate

(73) Why is there this Turnover Rate?

(1) Leaving Job
(2) Promotion
(3) Seasonal
(4) Other

(74) How Does Union Affect Hiring Policies?

(1) No Union for Industry
(2) Hire only from Union per Union Contract
(3) Hire only from Union because of oversupply from union source
(4) Union gets first chance, but if can't fill job, then non-union sources utilized
(5) Free to Hire from any source

(75) If free to hire from any source, what sources do you usually use?

(1) Not Applicable
(2) Private Agencies
(3) NYSES
(4) Walk-Ins
(5) Advertising,etc.
(6) Friends
(7) Unions
(8) Other

(1-2) Card # 07

(3-5) RYT # __________

(6 11) Correction # __________

How Much Inconvenience Would Be Caused If He:

(12) Had to Work Without Supervisior

(1) Critical
(2) Important
(3) Moderate
(4) Indifferent

(13) Was Slow in Learning:

(1) Critical
(2) Important
(3) Moderate
(4) Indifferent

(14) Was A Slow Worker:

(1) Critical
(2) Important
(3) Moderate
(4) Indifferent

(1) None
(2) Interest
(3) Aptitude (ability to learn)
(4) Intelligence
(5) Personality
(6) Specific Skills
(7) Other

(77) Do You Have a Formal Training Program?

(1) Yes
(2) No

How Much Inconvenience Would Be Created If He :

(78) Didn't Show Up After Being Hired

(1) Critical
(2) Important
(3) Moderate
(4) Indifferent

(79) Proved Less Skillful Than Anticipated

(1) Critical
(2) Important
(3) Moderate
(4) Indifferent

(80) Didn't Get Along With People

(1) Critical
(2) Important
(3) Moderate
(4) Indifferent

(1) Critical
(2) Important
(3) Moderate
(4) Indifferent

(16) In this company, isthere a logical next step?

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Only through Civil Service Exams

(17) Does the next logical step involve more than just a higher degree of same skill

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not applicable

(18) Does the next logical step involve more responsibility

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not applicable

(19) Does this young man qualify for the next step?

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not Applicable

If young man does not qualify for next logical step, would the following be of help?

(20) Education

(1) Yes
(2) No

(21) Experience

(1) Yes
(2) No

(22) Union Affiliations

(1) Yes
(2) No

(23) Is Trainee Still Employed By Company

(1) Yes
(2) No

(33) Persistent Lateness & Irregular Attendance

(1) Yes
(2) No

(34) Personal Appearance

(1) Yes
(2) No

(35) Suspicion of Theft,etc.

(1) Yes
(2) No

(24) Is Trainee On:

(1) Same Job
(2) Different Job
(3) Not Applicable

(25) If he is still with company, is his present job a:

(1) promotion
(2) demotion
(3) Not applicable

(26) Was employee dismissed by company

(1) Yes
(2) No

(27) Why Was Empoloyee Dismissed

(1) Not Applicable
(2) Wanted More Money
(3) Layed Off Due to Business Conditions
(4) Military Service
(5) Health
(6) Never Appeared For Work
(7) Poor Work

If Dismissed for Poor Work, Specify What

(28) Too Slow

(1) Yes
(2) No

(29) Not Skilled Enough
(1) Yes
(2) No

(30) Not Educated Enough

(1) Yes
(2) No

(31) Didn't Work Well With Others

(1) Yes
(2) No

(32) Didn't Take Supervision

(1) Yes
(2) No

(36) If employee left of own accord, why?

(1) Not applicable
(2) Took Another Job
(3) Went Back to School
(4) Personal Health
(5) Left to Assume Personal Family Responsibilities (sickness,etc)
(6) Gave Notice, but without explanation
(7) Left Job Without Notice
(8) Other

(37) What is Supervisor's General, Overall Feeling - Did Boy

(1) Succeed on Job
(2) Fail on Job

(38) How Was Boy's Overall Attendance?

(1) Excellent
(2) Good
(3) Fair
(4) Unsatisfactory

(39) How Was Boy's Overall Punctuality?

(1) Excellent
(2) Good
(3) Fair
(4) Unsatisfactory

(40) How Was Boy's Overall Cooperation With Supervisor

(1) Excellent
(2) Good
(3) Fair
(4) Unsatisfactory

(41) How Was Boy's Overall Ability to Master Job Requirements?

(1) Excellent
(2) Good
(3) Fair
(4) Unsatisfactory

(42) How Was Boy's Overall Personal Appearance

(1) Excellent
(2) Good
(3) Fair
(4) Unsatisfactory

(24) Is Trainee On:

(1) Same Job
(2) Different Job
(3) Not Applicable

(25) If he is still with company, is his present job a:

(1) promotion
(2) demotion
(3) Not applicable

(26) Was employee dismissed by company

(1) Yes
(2) No

(27) Why Was Empoloyee Dismissed

(1) Not Applicable
(2) Wanted More Money
(3) Layed Off Due to Business Conditions
(4) Military Service
(5) Health
(6) Never Appeared For Work
(7) Poor Work

If Dismissed for Poor Work, Specify What

(28) Too Slow

(1) Yes
(2) No

(29) Not Skilled Enough
(1) Yes
(2) No

(30) Not Educated Enough

(1) Yes
(2) No

(31) Didn't Work Well With Others

(1) Yes
(2) No

(32) Didn't Take Supervision

(1) Yes
(2) No

(36) If employee left of own accord, why?

(1) Not applicable
(2) Took Another Job
(3) Went Back to School
(4) Personal Health
(5) Left to Assume Personal Family Responsibilities (sickness,etc)
(6) Gave Notice, but without explanation
(7) Left Job Without Notice
(8) Other

(37) What is Supervisor's General, Overall Feeling - Did Boy

(1) Succeed on Job
(2) Fail on Job

(38) How Was Boy's Overall Attendance?

(1) Excellent
(2) Good
(3) Fair
(4) Unsatisfactory

(39) How Was Boy's Overall Punctuality?

(1) Excellent
(2) Good
(3) Fair
(4) Unsatisfactory

(40) How Was Boy's Overall Cooperation With Supervisor

(1) Excellent
(2) Good
(3) Fair
(4) Unsatisfactory

(41) How Was Boy's Overall Ability to Master Job Requirements?

(1) Excellent
(2) Good
(3) Fair
(4) Unsatisfactory

(42) How Was Boy's Overall Personal Appearance

(1) Excellent
(2) Good
(3) Fair
(4) Unsatisfactory

(43) Were there changes over time

(1) Yes
(2) No

(44) Were the changes toward

(1) Improvement
(2) Deterioration

(45) If change was toward improvement, what were these?

(1) Not applicable
(2) With additional training
(3) Personality & Appearance
(4) In responsibility
(5) in relating to people
(6) in work

(46) If change was toward deterioration, what were these?

(1) Not applicable
(2) in performance
(3) in attitude to job
(4) in attendance
(5) did not stay on job long
(6) in punctuality

(47) What is the most characteristic or typical pattern of interaction that you recall

(1) Willing to Work
(2) Unwilling to Work
(3) Willing to Learn
(4) Pleasant Disposition
(5) Overwhelmed by Surroundings
(6) Detached from Fellow Workers
(7) Fear
(8) Poor Attitude Toward Job
(9) None

(48) Did Boy Make Friends

(1) Yes
(2) No

(49) Did Boy Seem Impulsive?

(1) Yes
(2) No

(50) Did Boy Seem Open?

(1) Yes
(2) No

(54) Who ON RYT Staff was available?

(1) Job Developer
(2) Placement Counselor
(3) Personal Counseling for Boy
(4) Other
(5) Not Applicable

(55) What was their mode of contact?

(1) Called
(2) Wrote
(3) Visited
(4) Not Applicable

(56) Could you have used more help from RYT staff?

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not applicable

(57) In What Areas Could You have Used More Help?

(1) Counseling for Boy
(2) Guidance for Boy
(3) Consultation with Employee
(4) Further Training for Boy
(5) Other
(6) Not Applicable

(58) Did You Ask for Help You Didn't Get?

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not Applicable

(59) What Additional Services do you recommend for a more effective program?

(1) Improve Appearance & Grooming
(2) More Counseling & Guidance
(3) Heighten Self-Image & Sense of Responsibility
(4) Improve 3R's
(5) Improved Job Training
(6) Procure Bonding
(7) Increase Relationship Between Employer & J.D.
(8) Improve Judging Boy for Job
(9) Increase Respect for Others

51) Did Boy Seem Shy ?

(1) Yes
(2) No

52) Did Boy Seem Guarded?

(1) Yes
(2) No

53) Was RYT Available to You After The Placement?

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not Applicable

(60) Would You Be Willing to Participate in Another Voc. Ed Program?

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Possibly

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

(RECEPTION INTERVIEW)

NAME ____
Last   First   M.I.

IDENTIFYING DATA
(24) ______
(25) ______
(26) ______
(27)
LEGAL HISTORY
(28) ______
(29) ______
(30) ______
(31) ______
(32) ______
(33) ______
(34) ______
(35) ______
(36) ______
(37) ______
(38) ______
(39) ______
(40) ______
FAMILY LIFE
(41) ______
(42) ______
(43) ______
(44) ______
(45) ______
(46) ______
EDUCATION
(47) ______
EMPLOYMENT
(48) ______
(49) ______
(50) ______
(51) ______
(52) ______
(53) ______
MILITARY HISTORY
(54) ______
(55) ______
(56) ______
DRUG HISTORY
(57) ______
(58) ______
(59) ______
(60) ______
(61) ______

(24) Race ______________________
(25) Religion ______________________
(26) Nativity ______________________
(27) Citizen ______________________

LEGAL HISTORY

(28)(29) Arrested for __________
(30)(31) Convicted of __________
(32) Term ______________________
(33)(34) Length of sentence ____
(35) Warrant ______________________
(36) # Prior arrests __________
(37) # Prior convictions ______
(38) # Prior Incarcerations ____
(39) Pattern of offense ________
(40) Escape record ____________

FAMILY LIFE

(41) Marital Status ____________
(42) # Children ________________
(43) Family on Welfare _________
(44) # Residence past 5 Yrs ____
(45) Prior living arrangements _
____
(46) Type accomodations ________

MILITARY HISTORY

(54) Military history ____
(55) Length service _____
(56) Type discharge _____

DRUG HISTORY

(57) Drug History _______
(58) Age first use _______
(59) Frequency first use _
(60) Last frequency ______
(61) Daily cost __________

MEDICAL DATA

(62) Psychotherapy _______
(63) Homosexual __________
(64) Physical Handicap __
(65) Speech defect ______
(66) Scarred ____________
(67) Serious Illness ____
(68) Disfigured _________

LITERACY

English

(69) Read ______________
(70) Write _____________
(71) Speak _____________

MEDICAL DATA

(62)______
(63)______
(64)______
(65)______
(66)______
(67)______
(68)______

LITERACY

(69)______
(70)______
(71)______
(72)______
(73)______
(74)______

EDUCATION

(47) Highest school grade______

EMPLOYMENT

(48)(49) Type last position____
(50) Duration last position___
(51)(52) Type prior position__
(53) Earnings at last job______

Spanish

(72) Read______________
(73) Write_____________
(74) Speak_____________

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

NAME ____
Last First Middle

(1-7) Number ______________

(8) Card Number ______________

(9-14) Birth Date ______________

(15) Ethnic Group

- (1) White
- (2) Negro
- (3) Puerto Rican
- (4) Other

(16) Religion

- (1) Roman Catholic
- (2) Protestant
- (3) Jewish
- (4) Muslim
- (5) Other
- (6) None
- (7) Not Stated

(17-18) Nativity

- (1) Bronx
- (2) Brooklyn
- (3) Manhattan
- (4) Queens
- (5) Richmond
- (6) Northeast States
- (7) Southeast States
- (8) Midwest
- (9) West
- (10) Puerto Rico
- (11) Foreign and other U.S. Possessions
- (12) Not stated

(36) # Prior Convictions

- (0) None
- (1) One
- (2) Two
- (3) Three
- (4) Four
- (5) Five
- (6) Six
- (7) More than Six
- (8) Not Stated

(37) # Prior Incarcerations

- (0) None
- (1) One
- (2) Two
- (3) Three
- (4) Four
- (5) Five
- (6) Six
- (7) More than Six
- (8) Not Stated

(38) Pattern of Offense

- (1) Drug
- (2) Larceny
- (3) Assault
- (4) Dis. Cond.
- (5) Sex
- (6) Robbery
- (7) Burglary
- (8) Non Support
- (9) Other

(39) Escape Record

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

(19-24) Arrested For ____________

(25-30) Convicted of ____________

(31) Term ____________________

(32-33) Sentence ______________

(34) Warrant

(1) Yes
(2) No

(35) # Prior Arrests

(0) None
(1) One
(2) Two
(3) Three
(4) Four
(5) Five
(6) Six
(7) More than Six
(8) Not Stated

(40) Marital Status

(1) Single
(2) Common Law
(3) Married
(4) Separated
(5) Divorced
(6) Widowed
(7) Other
(8) Not Stated

(41) No. of Children

(0) None
(1) One
(2) Two
(3) Three
(4) Four
(5) Not Stated

(42) Family on Welfare

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Don't Know
(4) Not Stated

(43) No. Residences in Last 5 Years

(1) One
(2) Two
(3) Three
(4) Four
(5) Five
(6) Six
(7) Seven
(8) Eight or More

(48-49) Type Last Position prior to incarceration

(01) Professional
(02) Semi-Professional
(03) Foreman
(04) Craftsman
(05) Sales
(06) Clerical
(07) Service Worker
(08) Domestic
(09) Laborer
(10) Operatives or Mech.
(11) Student
(12) Armed Forces
(13) Extra-Legal
(14) Other
(15) Not Stated

(50) Duration Last Position

(1) Less than 1 month
(2) 1 to 5 months
(3) 5 months to 1 year
(4) 1 to two years
(5) 2 to 4 years
(6) 4 to ten years
(7) Not Stated

(0) Alone
(1) Parent(s)
(2) Wife
(3) Sibling
(4) Grandparent
(5) Other Relative
(6) Friend
(7) Agency
(8) Other
(9) Not Stated

(45) Type Living Accomodations before Arrest

(1) Own Home
(2) Rent Home
(3) Own Apartment
(4) Rent Apartment
(5) Furnished Room
(6) Residential Club or Hotel
(7) Agency
(8) Other
(9) Not Stated

(46) Highest Grade Attained

(0) None
(1) Some Grade School
(2) Grade School Grad.
(3) Some Junior High
(4) Junior High Grad.
(5) Some High School (10th or higher)
(6) High School Grad.
(7) Some College
(8) College Grad.
(9) Not Stated

(47) Employment Status at Time of Arrest

(1) Employed
(2) Unemployed
(3) Not Stated

(55-56) Drug History

(00) None
(01) Heroin
(02) Morphine/Dilaudid
(03) Demoral/Methadone
(04) Marijuana
(05) Barbiturates/Bromides
(06) Cocaine
(07) Benzadrine/Amphetamine
(08) Peyote
(09) Other
(10) Not Stated

(51) Earnings at Last Job

(0) Under $20 per week
(1) $21 to $40
(2) $41 to $60
(3) $61 to $80
(4) $81 to $100
(5) $101 to $120
(6) $120 to $140
(7) $140 to $160
(8) $161 and over
(9) Not Stated

(52) Military History

(0) Did Not Serve
(1) Army(drafted)
(2) Army(enlisted)
(3) Navy
(4) Marine Corps
(5) Air Force
(6) Coast Guard
(7) Reserves
(8) Other
(9) Rejected

(53) Length of Service

(1) Less than 1 year
(2) 1 to 2 years
(3) 2 to 4 years
(4) Does Not Apply
(5) Not Stated

(54) Type of Discharge

(1) Honorable
(2) General
(3) Medical
(4) Undesirable
(5) Bad Conduct
(6) Dishonorable
(7) Does Not Apply
(8) Not Stated

(66-67) Seriousness Illness

(00) None
(01) Jaundice
(02) Asthma
(03) Epilepsy
(04) Gonorrhea
(05) Syphillis
(06) Blackouts
(07) Diphtheria
(08) Scarlet Fever
(09) Other__________
(10) Not Stated

(0) Alone
(1) Parent(s)
(2) Wife
(3) Sibling
(4) Grandparent
(5) Other Relative
(6) Friend
(7) Agency
(8) Other
(9) Not Stated

(45) Type Living Accomodations before Arrest

(1) Own Home
(2) Rent Home
(3) Own Apartment
(4) Rent Apartment
(5) Furnished Room
(6) Residential Club or Hotel
(7) Agency
(8) Other
(9) Not Stated

(46) Highest Grade Attained

(0) None
(1) Some Grade School
(2) Grade School Grad.
(3) Some Junior High
(4) Junior High Grad.
(5) Some High School
(10th or higher)
(6) High School Grad.
(7) Some College
(8) College Grad.
(9) Not Stated

(47) Employment Status at Time of Arrest

(1) Employed
(2) Unemployed
(3) Not Stated

([illegible]56) Drug History

(00) None
(01) Heroin
(02) Morphine/Dilaudid
(08) Demoral/Methadone
(04) Marijuana
(05) Barbiturates/Bromides
(06) Cocaine
(07) Benzadrine/Amphetamine
(08) Peyote
(09) Other
(10) Not Stated

(51) Earnings at Last Job

(0) Under $20 per week
(1) $21 to $40
(2) $41 to $60
(3) $61 to $80
(4) $81 to $100
(5) $101 to $120
(6) $120 to $140
(7) $140 to $160
(8) $161 and over
(9) Not Stated

(52) Military History

(0) Did Not Serve
(1) Army(drafted)
(2) Army(enlisted)
(3) Navy
(4) Marine Corps
(5) Air Force
(6) Coast Guard
(7) Reserves
(8) Other
(9) Rejected

(53) Length of Service

(1) Less than 1 year
(2) 1 to 2 years
(3) 2 to 4 years
(4) Does Not Apply
(5) Not Stated

(54) Type of Discharge

(1) Honorable
(2) General
(3) Medical
(4) Undesirable
(5) Bad Conduct
(6) Dishonorable
(7) Does Not Apply
(8) Not Stated

(66-67) Seriousness Illness

(00) None
(01) Jaundice
(02) Asthma
(03) Epilepsy
(04) Gonorrhea
(05) Syphillis
(06) Blackouts
(07) Diphtheria
(08) Scarlet Fever
(09) Other ____________
(10) Not Stated

(1) 10 and Under
(2) 11 to 15
(3) 16 to 20
(4) 21 to 22
(5) Not Stated
(6) Does Not Apply

(58-59) Frequency at First Period of Drug Use

(00) Less than once a year
(01) 4 to 12 times a year
(02) Twice a month
(03) Once a week(M-F)
(04) Once a week-end
(05) More than once a week
(06) Once every day
(07) 2 to 4 times a day
(08) 5 or more times a day
(09) Not Stated
(10) Does Not Apply

(60-61) Frequency of Drug Use Before Arrest

(00) Less than once a year
(01) 4 to 12 times a year
(02) Twice a month
(03) Once a week(M-F)
(04) Once a week-end
(05) More than once a week
(06) Once every day
(07) 2 to 4 times a day
(08) 5 or more times a day
(09) Not Stated
(10) Does Not Apply

(62-63) Daily Cost of Habit Before Arrest

(00) Less than $5
(01) $5 to $10
(02) $10 to $15
(03) $15 to $20
(04) $20 to $25
(05) $25 to $30
(06) $30 to $35
(07) $35 to $40
(08) Over $40
(09) Not Stated
(10) Does Not Apply

(64) Homosexual

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not Stated

(65) Dibilitating Handicap

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not Stated

(68-69) Scars

(00) None
(01) Facial
(02) Body
(03) Appendeges
(04) Needle Tracks
(05) Congenital Disfiguremen
(06) Traumatic Disfigurement
(07) Not Stated

(70) Tatoos

(0) None
(1) One Arm
(2) Both Arms
(3) Body
(4) Body and One Arm
(5) Body and Both Arm
(6) Other
(7) Not Stated

(71) Read English

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not Stated

(72) Write English

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not Stated

(73) Speak English

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not Stated

(74) Read Spanish

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not Stated

(75) Write Spanish

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not Stated

(76) Speak Spanish

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Not Stated

(77-79) Beta IQ Score______

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B-1

Dismissals from Employment for Experimental and Control Subjects as Reported by Employers (1966)

Dismissed	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Yes	30	38	8	26
No	49	62	23	74
TOTAL	79	100	31	100

APPENDIX B-2

Type of Termination from First Employment After Release Reported by Experimental and Control Subjects (1966)

Type of Termination	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Fired: with/without cause	13	18	9	15
Quit: with/without cause	38	52	30	48
Layed off, Other	15	21	15	24
Outside Difficulties	7	10	8	13
TOTAL	73	101	62	100

APPENDIX B-3

Reasons for Termination of First Employment After Release as Reported by Experimental and Control Subjects (1966)

Reasons for Termination	Experimental			Control		
	No. of Jobs 82	No.	% of total jobs	No. of Jobs 72	No.	% of total jobs
More Money		15	18		19	26
Business Conditions		12	15		13	18
Took Another Position		23	28		15	21
Conflict with Supervisor		9	11		5	7
Conflict with Co-Workers		1	1		3	4
Good Relations with Supervisor, left for other reasons		55	67		43	60
Good Relations with Co-Workers, left for Other reasons		62	76		47	65
Job Too Demanding		13	16		6	8
Job Too Stressful		12	15		10	14
Job Repetitious		17	21		14	19
Job Isolated		9	11		5	7
Boss had too-high Standards		7	8		5	7
Boss Tried to Show he was Top Man, Too Bossy		4	5		4	5
Slowness of Subject's Work		3	4		4	5
Insufficient Skills		3	4		2	3
Low Education of Subject		4	5		0	0
Lateness of Subject		6	7		2	3
TOTAL		255*			197*	

---

*Total reflects total number of responses to reasons, not number of subjects responding, thus there is some overlapping.

APPENDIX B-4

Reasons for Termination of Most Recent Employment Reported by Experimental and Control Subjects (1966)

Reasons for Termination		Experimental			Control	
	No. of jobs 40	No.	%	No. of jobs 36	No.	%
More Money		3	7		7	19
Business Conditions		4	10		2	5
Took Another Job		2	5		3	8
Conflict with Supervisor		2	5		2	5
Conflict with Co-Workers		0	0		3	8
Good Relations with Supervisor, left for other reasons		24	60		18	50
Good Relations with Co-Workers, left for other reasons		27	67		19	53
Job Too Demanding		5	12		0	0
Job Too Stressful		5	12		2	5
Job Repetitious		6	15		3	8
Job Isolated		3	7		1	3
Boss had too-high standards		3	7		0	0
Boss tried to show he was Top Man, too Bossy		2	5		0	0
TOTAL		86*			60*	

---

*Total reflects total number of responses to reasons, not number of subjects responding, thus there is some overlapping.

APPENDIX B-4

Reasons for Termination of Most Recent Employment Reported by Experimental and Control Subjects (1966)

Reasons for Termination	Experimental			Control		
	No. of jobs 40	No.	%	No. of jobs 36	No.	%
More Money		3	7		7	19
Business Conditions		4	10		2	5
Took Another Job		2	5		3	8
Conflict with Supervisor		2	5		2	5
Conflict with Co-Workers		0	0		3	8
Good Relations with Supervisor, left for other reasons		24	60		18	50
Good Relations with Co-Workers, left for other reasons		27	67		19	53
Job Too Demanding		5	12		0	0
Job Too Stressful		5	12		2	5
Job Repetitious		6	15		3	8
Job Isolated		3	7		1	3
Boss had too-high standards		3	7		0	0
Boss tried to show he was Top Man, too Bossy		2	5		0	0
TOTAL		86*			60*	

---

*Total reflects total number of responses to reasons, not number of subjects responding, thus there is some overlapping.

APPENDIX B-6

Ability of Experimental-Control Subjects to Make Friends on Job as Reported by Employers (1966)

Ability to Make Friends	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Yes	39	72	24	100
No	15	28	0	0
TOTAL	54	100	24	100

APPENDIX B-7

Report by Employers of RYT Subjects on Outgoing Quality of Subjects as an Employee (1966)

Subject Outgoing	Experiment No.	Experiment %	Control No.	Control %
Yes	33	52	16	70
No	30	48	7	30
TOTAL	63	100	23	100

APPENDIX B-8

Report by Employers of RYT Subjects as to Whether Subjects Were Shy as Employees (1966)

Shy	Experiment No.	Experiment %	Control No.	Control %
Yes	20	31	3	13
No	44	69	20	87
TOTAL	64	100	23	100

APPENDIX B-9

Relationship of Adult Responsible for RYT Subject at Time of Admission to Rikers Island

Relative Responding	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Father, Stepfather	19	22	20	22
Mother, Grandmother, Stepmother	57	67	62	68
Other Relative, Foster Parent; Other	9	11	9	10
TOTAL	85	100	91	100

APPENDIX B-10

Number of Half Siblings of RYT Subjects reported by Parents & Relatives

Number of Half Siblings	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
None	60	71	63	69
One - Nine	24	29	28	31
TOTAL	84	100	91	100

APPENDIX B-11

Family Structure Presently at Home Of RYT Subject Reported by Parent or Relative

Family Structure	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Nuclear	67	81	78	87
Extended	12	14	11	12
Non-Family	4	5	1	1
TOTAL	83	100	90	100

APPENDIX B-12

Family Members Presently Employed in Home

Of RYT Subject Reported by Parent or Relative

Family Members Employed	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Doesn't Apply	13	16	19	22
Father (Or Surrogate) Only	18	22	16	18
Mother (Or Surrogate) Only	11	13	16	18
Both Parents or Surrogates	18	22	16	18
One or More Siblings, One Parent and One or More Siblings, Majority of People at Home, Other	23	28	21	24
TOTAL	83	101	88	100

APPENDIX B-13

Type of Employment Held by Head of Household

Of RYT Subject as Reported by Parent or Relative

Employment Position	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
None Not Employed Not Eligible for Labor Force	33	29	44	35
Professional Semi-Professional Managerial	15	13	12	10
Agricultural, Marine, Forestry	0	0	0	0
Clerical	33	29	17	14
Other, Sales	12	11	19	15
Protective or Services	21	18	32	26
TOTAL	114	100	124	100

APPENDIX B-14

Classification of Employment of Head Of Household Reported by Parent or Relative

Classification of Position	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Skilled, full/part time	25	21	40	32
Semi-Skilled	43	36	31	25
Unskilled, full/part time	52	43	53	43
TOTAL	120	100	124	100

APPENDIX B-15

Fathers' Employment During Subjects' Life as Reported by Parents & Relatives

Fathers' Employment	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Yes	67	79	65	73
No	18	21	24	27
TOTAL	85	100	89	100

APPENDIX B-16

Highest School Grade Completed by Head of Household in Which RYT Subject Lived Reported by Parents & Relatives

Highest School Grade	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
6th Grade and Under	9	11	19	21
7 - 9 Grade	24	29	35	39
10 - 12 Grade, non-graduate	31	37	15	17
12 Grade Graduate	16	19	16	18
Some College, College Graduate	3	4	4	4
TOTAL	83	100	89	99

APPENDIX B-17

Parent & Relative Response to Question of Whether Father Worked During Period of Time he was in Contact With RYT Subject

Fathers' Employment	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Yes	67	79	65	73
No	18	21	24	27
TOTAL	85	100	89	100

APPENDIX B-18

Highest School Grade Completed by Head of Household In Which RYT Subject Lived Reported by Parents & Relatives

Highest School Grade	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
6th Grade and Under	9	11	19	21
7-9 Grade	24	29	35	39
10 - 12 Grade, non-graduate	31	37	15	17
12 Grade Graduate	16	19	16	18
Some College, College Graduate	3	4	4	4
TOTAL	83	100	89	99

APPENDIX B-19

Relationship With

Father Reported by RYT Subjects

Relationship With Father	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Good	24	38	21	35
Fair	21	33	16	27
Poor	18	29	23	38
TOTAL	63	100	60	100

APPENDIX B-20

Relationship With Mother Reported by RYT Subjects

Relationship With Mother	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Good	54	74	51	72
Fair	13	18	13	18
Poor	6	8	7	10
TOTAL	73	100	71	100

APPENDIX B-21

Number of Fathers of RYT Subjects Presently Living Reported by Parents & Relatives

Fathers Presently Alive	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Yes	63	73	67	77
No	15	17	12	14
Unknown	8	9	8	9
TOTAL	86	99	87	100

APPENDIX B-22

Present Relationship of RYT Subjects With Fathers Reported by Parents & Relatives

Relationship	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Good	30	46	29	41
Fair	18	28	16	23
Low	17	26	26	37
TOTAL	65	100	71	101

APPENDIX B-23

Fathers Presence During Subject's Life Reported by Parents & Relatives

Fathers' Presence	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Yes	57	66	55	63
No	29	34	33	37
TOTAL	86	100	88	100

APPENDIX B-24

Place of Birth of RYT Subjects Reported by Parents & Relatives

Place of Birth	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Northeast States Inc., NYC	64	76	56	62
Southern States	9	11	12	13
Puerto Rico	7	8	19	21
Europe, West Indies	3	4	2	2
U.S. (Other than Northeast and South), Other	1	1	2	2
TOTAL	84	100	91	100

APPENDIX B-25

Number of Siblings Reported By Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

Number of Siblings	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
None	10	12	12	13
One-Two	29	34	30	33
Three-Four	31	36	24	26
Five or More	16	19	25	27
TOTAL	86	101	91	99

APPENDIX B-26

Present School Status Reported By Parents & Relatives for RYT Subjects

Present School Status	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Still Attending	1	1	4	4
Graduated High School	6	7	7	8
Not Graduated High School	71	83	66	73
Not Graduated Elementary School	4	5	3	3
Some College, College Graduate, Other	4	5	11	12
TOTAL	86	101	91	100

APPENDIX B-27

Difficulty With Schoolwork Reported by Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

Difficulty With Schoolwork	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Yes	28	33	37	41
No	57	67	53	59
TOTAL	85	100	90	100

APPENDIX B-28

History of Suspension or Expulsion From School Reported by Parent or Relative for RYT Subjects

Suspension or Expulsion	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Suspended	13	46	7	37
Expelled	10	36	9	47
Suspended and Expelled	5	18	3	16
TOTAL	28	100	19	100

APPENDIX B-29

Attitudes of Parents & Relatives

Regarding School Dropout of RYT Subjects

Attitudes	Experimental No.	%	Control No.	%
Felt right thing to do, mixed feelings	10	13	5	6
Neutral, No Opinion, Other	8	10	6	8
Some Concern, Extremely Upset	62	77	67	86
TOTAL	80	100	78	100

APPENDIX B-30

School Grade Average

Reported by Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

School Grade Average	Experimental No.	%	Control No.	%
High	13	15	16	18
Average	53	62	55	60
Low	19	22	20	22
TOTAL	85	99	91	100

APPENDIX B-31

CONFLICTS WITH TEACHERS REPORTED

By Parents & Relatives for RYT Subjects

Conflicts with Teachers	Experimental No.	%	Control No.	%
Yes	23	27	26	29
No	61	73	64	71
TOTAL	84	100	90	100

APPENDIX B-32

CONFLICTS WITH STUDENTS REPORTED

By Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

	Experimental		Control	
Conflicts with Students	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	11	13	14	16
No	74	87	76	84
TOTAL	85	100	90	100

APPENDIX B-33

Seriousness of Conflict in School As

Reported by Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

	Experimental		Control	
Seriousness of Conflict	No.	%	No.	%
None, A Little	67	83	65	76
Very Serious, Serious	9	11	9	11
Not Known, Other	5	6	11	13
TOTAL	81	100	85	100

APPENDIX B-34

Truancy or Disruptive Behavior in School as

Reported by Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

	Experimental		Control	
Truancy or Disruptive Behavior	No.	%	No.	%
Truancy	38	59	40	58
Disruptive Behavior	11	17	12	17
Truancy & Disruptive Behavior	15	23	17	25
TOTAL	64	99	69	100

APPENDIX B-35

Level of Education Parent or Relative Believes to be Necessary for RYT Subjects

Level of Education	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Satisfied with Present Level, Neutral	7	8	6	7
Some High School, High School Graduate	47	55	45	50
Attend Trade School	5	6	10	11
Some College, College Graduate, Graduate Work	27	31	29	32
TOTAL	86	100	90	100

APPENDIX B-36

Type of Job Held by RYT Subjects Prior to Incarceration as Reported by Parent or Relative

Employment Position	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
None	17	51	15	50
Managerial	0	0	0	0
Agricultural, Marine, Forestry	0	0	1	3
Clerical	13	39	6	20
Sales	3	9	3	10
Protective & Services	0	0	5	17
TOTAL	33	99	30	100

APPENDIX B-37

Attitudes of Parents & Relatives With Regard to Current Job Held by RYT Subject (1966)

Attitudes	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Satisfied	24	55	27	57
Ambivalent	6	14	5	11
Neutral, Other	5	11	9	19
Dissatisfied	9	20	6	13
TOTAL	44	100	47	100

APPENDIX B-38

Type of Employment Positions Desired For RYT Subjects by Parents & Relatives

Position Desired	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
No Specific Goal	28	35	34	38
Satisfied	10	13	18	20
Agricultural, Marine, Forestry, Clerical, Sales, Protective or Services	8	10	10	11
Semi-Skilled	12	15	6	7
Professional, Semi-Professional, Managerial	22	27	21	24
TOTAL	80	100	89	100

APPENDIX B-39

Nature of Spare Time Activities Reported by RYT Subjects

	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Individual	20	26	17	26
Formal	7	9	7	11
Informal	51	65	42	64
TOTAL	78	100	66	101

APPENDIX B-40

Spare Time Activities Reported by RYT Subjects

	Experimental		Control	
Type of Activities	No.	%	No.	%
Active	28	38	29	50
Quiet	12	16	13	22
Passive	33	45	16	28
TOTAL	73	99	58	100

APPENDIX B-41

Nature of Spare Time Activities of RYT Subjects Reported by Parents & Relatives

	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Individual	18	23	19	21
Formal Organized Group	4	5	5	6
Informal Group	45	56	52	58
Doesn't Know	13	16	14	16
TOTAL	80	100	90	101

APPENDIX B-42

Nature of Spare Time Activities of RYT Subjects Reported by Parent or Relative

Spare Time Activity	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Active	22	27	26	34
Quiet	9	11	8	10
Passive	36	44	24	31
Doesn't Know	15	18	19	25
TOTAL	82	100	77	100

APPENDIX B-43

Problems in Relationships With People Prior to Incarceration As Reported by Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

Problems With People	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
No Problems or Don't Know	24	28	29	32
Family Influences or Conflicts	8	9	8	9
Friends' Influences	53	62	51	57
Other	1	1	2	2
TOTAL	86	100	90	100

APPENDIX B-44

Societal Problems Prior To Incarceration as Reported by Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

Societal Problems	Experimental No.	%	Control No.	%
No Problems	50	62	59	65
Lack of Opportunity	17	21	4	4
Poor Schooling	6	7	13	14
Discriminating Practices, Other	8	10	15	16
TOTAL	81	100	91	99

p=.025
df= 3

APPENDIX B-45

Psychological Problems Prior to Incarceration Reported by Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

Psychological Problems	Experimental No.	%	Control No.	%
No Problems or Don't Know	21	25	28	31
Wouldn't Take Supervision from Parents	35	41	25	28
Wouldn't Study in School	15	18	12	13
Poor Emotional Control	10	12	13	14
Other	4	5	12	13
TOTAL	85	101	90	99

APPENDIX B-46

Physical Problems Prior to Incarceration

Reported by Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

	Experimental		Control	
Physical Problems	No.	%	No.	%
No Problems or Don't Know	69	80	56	62
Sickness, Poor Health, Physical Handicaps, Sensory Handicaps	12	14	10	11
Drugs	5	6	25	27
TOTAL	86	100	91	100

p = .005
df = 2

APPENDIX B-47

Psychological Problems at Present

Reported by Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

	Experimental		Control	
Psychological Problems	No.	%	No.	%
No Problems or Don't Know	55	64	54	61
Wouldn't Take Supervision From Parents	7	8	5	6
Wouldn't Study in School Wouldn't Work	3	3	3	3
Poor Emotional Control	14	16	14	16
Other	7	8	12	14
TOTAL	86	99	88	100

APPENDIX B-46

Physical Problems Prior to Incarceration

Reported by Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

	Experimental		Control	
Physical Problems	No.	%	No.	%
No Problems or Don't Know	69	80	56	62
Sickness, Poor Health, Physical Handicaps, Sensory Handicaps	12	14	10	11
Drugs	5	6	25	27
TOTAL	86	100	91	100

p = .005
df = 2

APPENDIX B-47

Psychological Problems at Present

Reported by Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

	Experimental		Control	
Psychological Problems	No.	%	No.	%
No Problems or Don't Know	55	64	54	61
Wouldn't Take Supervision From Parents	7	8	5	6
Wouldn't Study in School Wouldn't Work	3	3	3	3
Poor Emotional Control	14	16	14	16
Other	7	8	12	14
TOTAL	86	99	88	100

APPENDIX B-48

Physical Problems at Present

Reported by Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

Physical Problems	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
No Problems or Don't Know	71	85	62	70
Sickness, Poor Health Physical Handicaps Sensory Handicaps, Low Capacity	7	8	9	10
Drugs	6	7	18	20
TOTAL	84	100	89	100

APPENDIX B-49

Problems in Relationships With People

Reported by Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

Problems With People	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
No Problems or Don't Know	56	67	58	65
Family Influences or Conflicts	4	5	8	9
Friends' Influences	23	28	21	24
People at Work, Other	0	0	2	2
TOTAL	83	100	89	100

APPENDIX B-50

Societal Problems at Present

Reported by Parents & Relatives of RYT Subjects

Societal Problems	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
No Problems or Don't Know	62	76	68	76
Lack of Opportunity	6	7	2	2
Poor Schooling	8	10	8	9
Discriminating Practices, Other	6	7	11	12
TOTAL	82	100	89	99

APPENDIX B-51

Type of First Job Held

After Release Reported by RYT Subjects

First Employment Position	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
None	10	12	8	11
Laborer	24	29	30	42
Operator	15	18	8	11
Services, Food Services	12	15	14	19
Clerical, Sales	18	22	7	10
Crafts, Manager	2	2	3	4
Household Work, Other	1	1	2	3
TOTAL	82	99	72	100

APPENDIX B-52

Number of Jobs Held by RYT Subjects

After Release - Reported in Interview With Subject

Number of Employ. Positions	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
None	3	4	7	9
Same Job, One-Two Jobs	39	48	42	57
3-4 Jobs	33	40	14	19
5-7 or More Jobs	7	9	11	15
TOTAL	82	101	74	100

p=nearly .05
df=3

APPENDIX B-53

Number of 30 Day Jobs Held by RYT Subjects

After Release - Reported in Interview With Subjects

Number of 30 Day Positions	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
One	19	26	28	47
2-3	47	64	23	38
4-9 or More	7	10	9	15
TOTAL	73	100	60	100

p=.025
df=2

APPENDIX B-54

Employment Record After Release as Reported by RYT Subjects .

Employment Record	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Never Worked, Unable to Work	2	2	9	12
Worked Sporadically	19	23	18	25
Worked Steadily at 1-2 Jobs	43	53	32	44
Worked Steadily at More Than 2 Jobs	15	19	10	14
Other	2	2	3	4
TOTAL	81	99	72	99

APPENDIX B-55

Evaluation of Success-Failure Experience In Work After Release as Reported by RYT Subjects

Success-Failure Experience	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Overwhelmingly Negative	6	8	11	15
Partially Negative	17	21	13	18
Indifferent, Other	14	18	6	8
Partially Positive	17	21	13	18
Strongly Positive	26	33	31	42
TOTAL	80	101	74	101

APPENDIX B-56

Base Pay Reported by Employers for RYT Subjects

Base Pay Per Week	Experimental No.	%	Control No.	%
0 - $40	1	1	2	5
$41 - 60	43	56	24	65
$61 - 80	29	38	7	19
$81 - 140	4	5	4	11
TOTAL	77	100	37	100

APPENDIX B-57

Success or Failure on Job Reported by Employers for RYT Subjects

	Experimental No.	%	Control No.	%
Success	39	53	18	67
Failure	35	47	9	33
TOTAL	74	100	27	100

APPENDIX B-58

Attendance Record For RYT Subjects as Reported by Employers

Attendance Record	Experimental No.	%	Control No.	%
Excellent	13	18	6	23
Good	26	35	11	42
Fair	12	16	4	15
Unsatisfied	23	31	5	19
TOTAL	74	100	26	99

APPENDIX B-59

Turnover Rate in Organizations Hiring RYT Subjects Reported by Employers

Turnover Rate	Experimental No.	%	Control No.	%
Rapid	24	30	13	35
Slow	24	30	6	16
Moderate	32	40	18	49
TOTAL	80	100	37	100

APPENDIX B-60

Comparison of Type of Parole Violations For RYT Subjects From Parole Commission Records (1966)

Type of Parole Violations	Experimental No.	%	Control No.	%
Technical	26	36	19	30
Arrest	47	64	45	70
TOTAL	73	100	64	100

APPENDIX B-61

Time Spent in Jail During Supervision by Parole Commission Reported for RYT Subjects From Commission Records

Months Spent in Jail	Experimental No.	%	Control No.	%
0-6	10	9	10	9
7-12	56	50	35	33
13-18	21	19	28	26
19-24	14	13	21	20
25 or More	11	10	13	12
TOTAL	112	101	107	100

APPENDIX B-62

Parole Warrants Issued for RYT Subjects (1964-1966)

Parole Warrant Issued	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Yes	75	67	71	68
No	37	33	33	32
TOTAL	112	100	104	100

APPENDIX B-63

Parole Violations for RYT Subjects (1964 - 1966)

Parole Violations	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Yes	74	66	70	67
No	38	34	34	33
TOTAL	112	100	104	100

APPENDIX B-64

Daily Cost of Drug Prior To Incarceration Reported by RYT Subjects in Interview

Daily Cost	Experimental No.	Experimental %	Control No.	Control %
Less than $5	4	40	6	21
$5-$10	3	30	11	38
$10-$20	1	10	6	21
$20-$40 or More	2	20	6	21
TOTAL	10	100	29	101

APPENDIX B-62

Parole Warrants Issued for RYT Subjects (1964-1966)

Parole Warrant Issued	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	75	67	71	68
No	37	33	33	32
TOTAL	112	100	104	100

APPENDIX B-63

Parole Violations for RYT Subjects (1964 - 1966)

Parole Violations	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	74	66	70	67
No	38	34	34	33
TOTAL	112	100	104	100

APPENDIX B-64

Daily Cost of Drug Prior To Incarceration Reported by RYT Subjects in Interview

Daily Cost	Experimental		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%
Less than $5	4	40	6	21
$5-$10	3	30	11	38
$10-$20	1	10	6	21
$20-$40 or More	2	20	6	21
TOTAL	10	100	29	101

APPENDIX C

I. Reading Laboratory III a

The Reading Laboratory program is designed to begin each student at his individual reading level and permit him to progress at his own rate. Individual reading levels are determined by a standardized test. Laboratory materials cover Grades 3 through 12. They consist of three types of developmental devices: (a) Power Builders; (b) Rate Builders; (c) Listening Skill Builders.

The Power Builders are booklets containing a reading selection and objective type questions entitled, "How Well Did You Read?". Students are given a scoring key with the correct answers and encouraged to re-read the selections so that he may understand where and how he mis-read the material. Also included is a series of questions entitled, "Learn About Words", which provides a basic "lesson" commensurate with reading level of the material and illustrated by an exercise which the student works out and scores. The student keeps a daily progress chart on his work which includes a daily profile in terms of his percentage of correct answers. This enables the teacher to make upward or downward adjustments of the reading level of the material given any student at any stage of instruction.

Rate Builders are timed three-minute exercises in which the student is given a reading selection in line with his reading level and corrects and scores his answers to questions related to the selection. The Rate Builder, as the name implies, is designed to aid the student to gradually increase his reading speed as well as comprehension.

Listening Skill Builders gradually increase the student's listening comprehension. The teacher reads a selection aloud and the students answer questions related to the material in their individual booklets. Similar to all the other material in the laboratory, a daily progress chart is scored by each student.

II. Reading for Understanding

This program consists of a set of graded reading selections which focus upon that aspect of comprehension which has to do with drawing valid inference from what is read and seeing logical implications in it. As with the reading laboratory, a placement test permits each student to begin at his own achievement level. Progress is recorded daily so that student and teacher are permitted an objective evaluation. Learning reinforcement is permitted by involving the student in re-reading and analyzing where mistakes are made. Reading selections encompass reading achievement levels 5 through 12.

APPENDIX D

The materials in Appendix D are working papers and memoranda prepared by staff members during the life of the project and provide some interesting detail on the kinds of problems that were encountered and their solutions. In sequence they are concerned with philosophy of aftercare, release procedures, disbursement of funds to trainees, collection of loans, agencies contacted by RYT, employer contacts, employer attitudes and follow-up procedures.

APPENDIX D

DATE: November 19, 1964

PROPOSED RYT TRAINEE AFTERCARE/FOLLOW UP PROGRAM

One of the lacks of the RYT program to date has been a systematized aftercare/ follow-up program which meets the requirements of the Project. As per your instructions, and pursuant to the meeting with you and Dr. Ehrlich, I am preparing an outline of the proposed trainee aftercare/ follow-up program.

Overall Program

The program will have three-fold emphasis. One aspect will be *preventive/ameliorative*, in that the focus will be on dealing with problems as soon as they are ascertained or show themselves. The second emphasis will be *corrective/supportive*, in that the trainees' problems of an occupational or personal nature will be handled on a group basis. There is a real need for this latter aspect, in that the boys should have a cathartic outlet to vent and/or satisfy their emotional needs, anxieties and hostilities. Concomitantly, a program of constructive social activities will be instituted as a means of widening the boys' cultural horizons and helping to bring about change in their "style of life," especially their use of leisure time, which seems to be at the bottom of much of their trouble. Implicit in the above is that the proposed program will be integrated and coordinated in its pre-release *and* post-release phases, so that effective treatment continuity may be maintained as far as possible.

Programming and services will have to be considered for the following groups:

✓1) Boys who have been released;
2) Boys in training; SM & RR.
3) Boys who have completed training and are serving out the remainder of their sentences; BY REQUEST
4) Boys who have reached the age of 21 and have been transferred to the penitentiary; BY REQUEST
5) Boys who have been returned to Rikers Island as recidivists. ONLY FOR RESEARCH.

Pre-Release Program

As soon as each cycle begins its classroom and practical work in the IBM program, the practice has been to contact new trainees via interviews for background (family and personal) information, and to deal with any problems seen by them as requiring handling or answering. Trainee requests range from discharge dates to the need for clothes, money and home or a place to stay. When the boys are cut off from information sources, it tends to increase or foster tension and anxiety. Up to now, there has been little opportunity for aftercare/follow-up staff to develop a meaningful and close relationship with the trainees. This has impsed a great handicap on the aftercare program which, it is hoped, weekly contacts by staff will rectify. Pre-release programming is planned with the above in mind.

Preventive Programming

Trainees will be contacted by RYT follow-up/aftercare staff during their first two weeks in the program, for purposes of gathering background information, ascertaining problems, and getting acquainted.

Trainees will be contacted one to two times a week by staff during the remainder of their residence at Rikers Island, in order to develop rapport and a meaningful relationship with them which will carry over after discharge.

(a) During staff contacts with trainees (weekly visits, personal management meetings, individual contacts, etc.) when problems are detected, treatment will be started and information compiled that will provide for effective continuity of treatment or dealing with problems faced by the trainees. Contacts with selected families will be started at this time.

(b) S.S.E. (Social Service Exchange) material will be gathered on each trainee during the first two weeks, for research purposes, for indicators of the extent and type of problem behavior, family economic status, etc.; in addition, trainees interviewed will have a Check List of Problems and Needed Services filled out on them and acted upon.

(c) During these initial contacts and after release, trainees will be encouraged to return to school and/or make plans for themselves more definite than the usual "get a job of some kind."

Post-Release Program and Procedures

1. Release-Processing at 100 Centre St., Parole Office, consisting of:
   - (a) Counseling of trainee
   - (b) Setting up appointments for trainee with other staff
   - (c) Making RYT loans and supplying clothes when necessary. Loans continue until trainee's first pay check.

2. Making Regular Individual Contacts with Trainee and His Family for information feedback, counseling purposes, and ascertaining trainee/family problems, then dealing with them.
3. Contacting boy's parole officer every two weeks to check on how well he is doing in parole, actual or impending changes in parole status, etc., so that he can be worked with to deter recidivism.
4. Once-a-week intra-staff meetings (Aftercare and Job Placement) re sharing information on trainees with actual or emergent problems or facing a crisis or in need of support.

Corrective/Supportive Programming*

A group counseling program will be instituted as soon as possible, which will be geared to the needs, problems, and time-schedules of the various categories of RYT trainees.

(a) Frequency of Meetings: Meetings will be held on a weekly or bi-weekly basis, depending on which basis RYT finds most successful in having the trainees come to meetings. If held once a week, meetings will be ~~one~~ 1½ hour in length. If held every two weeks, they will be an hour and a half, or two hours in duration.

(b) Types of Meetings:

(1) Counseling-type Meetings, where trainee personal problems of whatever sort will be dealt with, and

(2) Feedback-Informational-type Meetings, where the main purpose will be the dissemination of information to and from the trainee.

---

*Later on, after the trainees have been successfully brought into this aspect of the program, their parents also may be programmed via group discussions if conditions warrant it.

(c) Composition of Groups:

The make-up of the groups will be determined primarily by a trainee's employment status.* Time of the meetings will also be determined by this factor. Accordingly, one group will be made up of unemployed trainees, the other of those who are employed. Employed boys will meet in the evening after work-hours; unemployed trainees will meet during the day.

Initially, at least, the groups will be made up of five members unless the total number of trainees showing up for meetings makes it necessary to have larger groupings.

(d) Group Leadership:

Groups will led by RYT staff--in this case, Dr. Ehrlich and Dr. Walker and/or other selected staff. If intensive individual (or group) psychotherapy becomes necessary, or seems indicated, outside sources will be explored in terms of monies and/or volunteer services, in case RYT budget for this purpose is either inadequate or non-existent.

(e) Process Recording, Research Data Gathering Procedures:

If enough rapport exists or can be developed, the meetings may be taped and/or the trainees will fill out questionnaires. Appropriate check-lists and questionnaires will be devised to tap this important source of information.

---

*A second grouping possibility later in the project may be cycle-grouping, whereby group composition will be determined by cycle-membership.

Constructive Social Activity Programming

Those who work with youth from lower socio-economic levels are also as often impressed with their cultural/recreational poverty as with their lack of money and esthetically poor environment. New York City's gang-workers and other type group workers comment on how bound these youths are to their home-communities and how few times they leave their home-areas, except to go to school, court, or similar formal occasions. They even dislike working too far from home, as do RYT trainees. Moreover, when they do go out of their neighborhood, it is often not for the constructive leisure-time use of facilities and leisure-time programming, e.g., bowling, YMCA, or plays, etc. It is this lack of proper use of spare time which has caused and will continue to cause many RYT trainees to get into trouble, unless they are taught better while being programmed in other ways.

Several of our trainees now back at Rikers have pointed out that this is one of the few lacks in the RYT aftercare/follow up program. Experience with the type of youth RYT works with has indicated that they do not care for passive sports, whether spectator or participant. Action is the word and much of our programmed recreational activities should reflect this fact. Thus, some of the things our trainees will be introduced to will be:

(a) Membership in YMCA's selected for their program and/or available athletic equipment (e.g., weights, swimming pools, boxing, punching bags, wrestling, jazz concerts, photography, ball, volleyball, handball, squash, etc.

(b) RYT-sponsored Social and Recreational Activities (e.g., taking groups bowling, to plays, out-of-town picnics Bear Mountin, etc.), various beaches, fishing trips, dances, (the boys might organize and hold these dances and other events themselves, so that RYT staff would be doing things with rather than for the boys), attending football, baseball, and basketball games, swimming meets, track meets, etc.

Itemized Costs to be Considered in this Program:

1. Postage, stamps and self-addressed post cards
2. Meeting room (YMCA or City College)
3. Refreshments
4. Consultant Costs (if any)
5. Subway Fares for Trainees (to RYT meetings and social events)
6. Volunteers (Carfare and meals)
7. Paying part of YMCA membership fees.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 2, 1964

SUBJECT: Philosophy, Policy
and Duties of RYT Aftercare/
Follow Up Unit

Scope of Operating Philosophy

The aftercare/follow up unit operates under the assumption that the RYT Project has certain responsibilities in terms of loans, services, treatment and referrals to those trainees who have completed ~~been enrolled in~~ the IBM program. This applies not only to cycles-in-training, but also to four (4) other groups. or categories of trainees;

1. Trainees transferred to the penitentiary as Overage (21-years-old)
2. Trainees from Other Cycles awaiting release.
3. Trainees returned to prison as Recidivists
4. Trainees Removed from the IBM Program at Rikers for committing a serious infraction.

However, these responsibilities to the trainees are seen as ending at a specific cut-off date. The Units will use six months (180 days from the date of discharge) as the cut-off date for cases with respect to eligibility for loans, services, treatment and referrals.*

Areas of Responsibility

The Unit has a number of interlocking responsibilities in the areas of research and programming of various types, and dealing with the trainees' personal problems during and after their stay at Rikers Island.

A. Pre-Release Responsibilities

While the trainees are at Rikers Island, Social Service aftercare/follow up will be responsible for the following:

1. Initial Interviews with the cycles-in-training, which will cover such things as Marks and Release Dates, Employment, Personal problems, Make-Up of Family Constellation, etc., as well as ascertaining the boys' financial and other needs and problems.

---

* Concomitantly, the cut-off date whereby trainees will be considered as a "success" or "failure" in job placement will be 3 months (90 days) of regular employment from the date of first job placement.

While the trainees are in residence, aftercare staff will check their family's financial status, willingness to provide a home for the boy, the type of housing rented or owned by the family, the amount of room available for family use, etc.

2. Continued Weekly Contacts with the Trainees currently in training.

Be responsible for setting up procedures to make contacts with these trainees, ascertain their release dates, make contacts with their families, and when necessary make referrals.

3. Periodic contacts with other categories of trainees, such as:

   (a) Trainees transferred to the penitentiary as @verage (21 yrs. old
   (b) Trainees from Other Cycles who have completed training and are awaiting release,
   (c) Trainees returned to prison as Recidivists,
   (d) Trainees removed from the IBM program at Rikers for committing a serious infraction.

4. Processing trainees for release from Rikers Island. This involves:

   (a) Giving the boy a Release Slip for IBM books* and classroom materials,
   (b) Telling the boy what the Project can or cannot do for him, that he will be met at the Parole Office at 100 Centre St., etc. If he has a definite sentence and thus does not report to parole, the boy is given directions to the field office.

B. Initial Post-Release Reponsibilities

When the trainees are taken from Rikers Island to the Parole Office at 100 Centre Street, RYT aftercare/follow up staff follows through on their part of the Release Processing by:

1. Meeting trainees at the Parole Office to give them additional information and counseling.
2. Setting up the job-placement referral to the RYT Field Office. Specifically, this means giving the trainee a card with the location of the Field Office, its phone number, RYT staff to contact, etc., and also calling the Field Office and putting the trainee on the phone to make his own appointment.
3. Giving the trainee financial assistance (loan, and/or clothes, etc.) if needed.
4. Referral to the RYT dentist (or a dental clinic) if needed.

---

*This concerns only the first two cycles. Trainees from the other cycles will not get their IBM books as the Project is unable to give every boy the 6 or 8 training manuals that make up the full training series.

C. Subsequent to Initial Trainee Release--Processing at the Parole Office, RYT's aftercare/follow up staff will be responsible

1. For keeping communication open between Parole and RYT, by periodic conferences with Parole Department supervising staff.
2. For making routing fortnightly checks on released trainees' status on parole.
3. For conducting interviews/ counseling sessions with discharged trainees-in-trouble (recidivists, doing poorly on parole, etc.).
4. Keeping close contact with trainees having special problems (e.g., drug use, maintaining employment, or having difficulty in adjusting to the community, etc.)
5. For making RYT maintenance loans (This will be made only by aftercare/follow up staff who will disburse such funds to needy trainees referred to them by RYT job-placement staff or those boys who themselves ask for loans for clothes or maintenance.)
6. For representing RYT when trainees are involved in court cases, going to the hospital for "illness" or injury, and/or have been arrested, rearrested and placed in detention.

Division of Labor Between RYT Field Office Units

Anything not coming under on-the-job performance or problems, e.g., chronic absenteeism or lateness, etc., will be handled by RYT aftercare/ follow up staff.

Any trainee problems requiring long-term or intensive care will be referred to the appropriate social agency or be taken over by the aftercare/follow up staff, as the case may be.

D. Programming Responsibilities

The Unit will be responsible for the devising, implementation, and supervision of aftercare/follow up programming on its several levels:

(a) Trainee referrals for treatment by interested and available community social agencies
(b) RYT staff-conducted group counseling, and
(c) Constructive social and recreational activities selected as being in keeping with the overall rehabilitative and therapeutic goals of Project for its trainees.

In keeping with "(a)" above, the Unit will be responsible for the development and utilization of community social agency resources for referral and/or treatment purposes which can take care of those problems of the trainees which lie beyond the capacities or resources of RYT's staff.

E. Re search Responsibilities

The Unit has certain duties as an arm of the RYT Research Unit: This includes such things as:

1. Devising interview forms, check-lists, column and code assignments, master cards, etc., for this section.

2. Conducting follow-up research interviews with the trainees (experimentals, only) and their prents.

3. Setting up and conducting research interviews with trainees-in-trouble (recidivists) who have failed parole.

4. Getting data on the Control Group from Parole Office and other agency files or records and transposing this to the form (Parole Officer's Check List) devised for this purpose.

5. Maintaining interview schedules so that the flow of information feedback to RYT's Data-Processing Unit is kept on a uniform basis and up-to-date.

6. Collecting SSE (Social Service Exchange) data from the Experimental and Control groups so that any gaps in information on the research population can be filled in if necessary.

MEMORANDUM

Date : 15 March 1965

Subject: RYT RELEASE POLICY

There have been several instances of trainees with definite sentences being released and having difficulty getting to the RYT Field Office. This has been at least partly our fault since we knew the release date.

One trainee pointed out, for edample, that when he was released and given his "quarter" that he had to give four (4) packs of cigarettes to get another quarter to pay his way to our Field Office. Another trainee had to phone to the Field Office to get directions on how to get there from the subway.

Accordingly, the following item will be added to our release procedure on Riker's Island:

a) When we get the boys' release date, we will also get his type of sentence.

b) If he has a definite sentence, (and if upon checking his personal funds, it is found that he has no money other than the quarter he gets from the Department of Correction), he is to be given $1.00 by our worker providing he has either finished the IBM course or is in the process of completing it. If the trainee volunterily withdraws from the program, RYT has no responsibility to him in the way of jobs or loans and such ex-trainees would not get the dollar on leaving Riker's Island.

c) The RYT Social Service Worker on Riker's Island will also give the boy explicit directions on how to get to the Field Office from the Ferry, and will instruct the boy to call the Field Office in order to set up an appointment and/or let us know he is coming.

William S. Walker

WILLIAM S. WALKER, Ph.D.
Social Service Coordinator

WSW:bec

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 7, 1964

SUBJECT: Policy for Disbursement
of RYT Contingency Funds

Regular Disbursements

The Aftercare/Follow Up Unit is responsible for the disbursing and collection of monies from the RYT Contingency Fund. In this connection, eligible trainees are given loans for clothing, dental services, maintenance loans*, etc., during the period between release and getting a regular job. These loans are supposed to be paid back in installments as soon as the trainee is financially able to begin making payments.

It is felt that the disbursement of monies from the RYT Contingency Fund should remain in the hands of those responsible for the accounting.

In all cases, aftercare must be consulted when the disbursement of Contingency Funds is contemplated, and not after monies have been given out.

Realizing the fact that RYT aftercare/follow up staff may not always be in the Field Office, an emergency fund will be left there at all times. This fund may be used only in the following emergencies. For example:

1. If a trainee has to report for an interview and has no carfare, he might be advanced a maximum of $2.00 for carfare and lunch until able to make arrangements for a regular maintenance loan from aftercare staff.
2. If a trainee has to report for an interview and needs carfare and also has to get dry-cleaning out, he might be advanced a maximum of $5.00 until able to make arrangements for a regular loan.**

---

* Maintenance loans were set at $15 per week for single trainees and $25 per week for married trainees.

** Trainees will not be eligible for weekly, full Contingency Fund maintenance loans after their first successful job placement.

It is not to be used for the routine buying of jobs for trainees, as the Fund was not created for this purpose. For example, the Job-Placement Unit is not to tell the boys that RYT will buy them jobs. Only as a last resort, after Job-Placement and the trainee have exhausted all free means for seeking employment, or if there is an emergency situation*, would this be done, and the boy could be told that if he finds a job for which he must pay, RYT would subsidize him for a loan of this type.

Regarding who should give out the emergenny funds whenever aftercare/follow staff is not available to do so, the procedure will work in the following way:

(a) A member of the Job-Placement Unit (Mr. Spindell or Mr. Cox) will give out such loans when aftercare/follow up staff is not in the field office.

(b) Whenever staff from either Unit are not available for this function, then a designated member of the secretarial staff will do so. In either case, the above indicated sum of $2.00 or $5.00 would not be exceeded unless authorized by the Coordinator of Social Services for a specific trainee.

In order that all staff involved in the handing out of loans from the Contingency Fund would know who is eligible and who is not among the trainees, a list will be compiled of those boys who are ineligible for loans. The list will be kept up to date including revisions to indicate the boys who again are eligible for loans.

If, in the judgment of aftercare and/or job-placement staff, a trainee has indicated or demonstrated an unwillingness to secure or maintain regular employment, he will not continue to be eligible for any type of Contingency Fund loans. Such case-rulings may be reviewed or reconsidered and the trainee found eligible for loans if staff feels a positive change of attitude has taken place or conditions warrant it.

The above includes alcoholics and drug users who are more interested in "chasing the bag" and drinking than in securing a job.

---

* An example of an emergency situation would be one where the boy has been told by his Parole Officer that unless he has employment by a certain date, he will be returned to Rikers as a technical violator, or he has to immediately help support himself or his family.

Miscellaneous Expenditures of RYT Contingency Funds

In addition to the regular authorized expenditures of RYT Funds, a number of miscellaneous expenditures are being made, e.g., to indigent boys in detention or in the hospital. So far they have involved the modest sum of $2.00 each on a one-time basis as the trainees are not visited regularly. However, if regular visits are made in such cases, some system or schedule of loans will have to be devised. Also, expenses involved in the administration, collection of outstanding loans (self-addressed postcards, mailing old checkbooks to Staten Island, etc., have been coming out of the overall RYT funds. These are considered to be legitimate expenditures and are listed as such in the monthly list sent to Mr. Schauffler of the Staten Island Mental Health Society, Inc.

Contingency Fund Weekly Maintenance Allotment Scale for R.Y.T. Graduates Prior to Employment.

Following is a tentative allotment scale for various categories of R.Y.T. graduates after their release. This scale may be subject to revision or modification in the light of experience and/or in the event that funds are made available by the Welfare Department. Trainees will be eligible for Financial Assistance prior to employment, while earning their first paycheck, or while unemployed if necessary.

Single Boys Away from Home (Living Alone):

In the case of a trainee who is living alone or away from home the below scale will apply:

Daily Maintenance Allotment		Weekly Total
Food	$2.50 per day	$ 3.50 per day
Carfare and Cigarettes	1.00 per day	x 7 days
Total:	$3.50 per day	$24.50 = Total

Single Boys at Home

In the case of a single boy living at home, it is felt that the family should at least be responsible for the boy's breakfast and dinner. During this period when the trainee is trying to get on his feet, i.e., subsequent to release and prior to his receiving his first paycheck, the R.Y.T. Project will assume the responsibility for the loan of funds for carfare, cigarettes and lunch.

Daily Maintenance Allotment		Weekly Total
Food	$ .75 per day for lunch	$1.75 per day x 5 days
Carfare and Cigarettes	$1.00 per day	$8.75 +66
Total:	$1.75 per day	$9.41 = Weekly Total

Cigarettes (2 packs)
Saturday-Sunday - $.66

All trainees, regardless of their marital status, will receive the above Maintenance Allotment scale, except in certain cases which will be considered on their special merits. The R.Y.T. Project is not a social agency, and has limited funds. Therefore, the most it can do is to loan a trainee a minimal sum to tide him over until he can contact or be directed to the appropriate agency used for referrals by R.Y.T.

MEMORANDUM

30 April 1965

Collection of Loans from RYT Trainees

The collection of RYT loans from our trainees has been and still is one of the areas of the program marked by a singular lack of success. Very few of the trainees (four of the total) have voluntarily repaid their loans with or without prodding from RYT staff. As a matter of fact, only at the beginning of the program was there any repaying of loans and this was dame on a face-to-face basis, i.e., the worker would go by the boy's workplac on payday and collect money from them. When the worker was no longer able to go around to see the boys, they immediately stopped apyments. Rarely do they use money orders as a way of repaying their loan.

In addition to the face-to-face method, a number of ways have been attempted by which to expedite repayments by the trainees. These have included letters on several occasions, sent to all boys owing monies to the Project, personal appeals to the boys when counseling contacts were made, and in one instance, through the trainee's parole officer as he felt the boy's failure to repay the loan was related to his lack of maturity and failure to assume his responsibilities as an adult. None of these methods used to-date have been successful on the whole, although there has been a limited response to our letter writing campaign.

Enclosed are the two form letters which are sent out periodically.

WILLIAM S. WALKER, Ph.D.
Social Service Coordinator
R. Y. T. Project

WSW:bec

RESTORATION of YOUTH through TRAINING PROJECT

633 Amsterdam Avenue

New York, New York 10024

Dear

To enable us to be of service to some of the other Trainees, we require the repayment of the money which you have borrowed as soon as possible. As was discussed at the time of the loan, this money should be repayed as soon as you are steadily employed.

At present you owe the R.Y.T. Project $__________

Remember, we cannot make loans to your fellow Trainees until we receive the money you owe us.

Please make checks or money orders payable to R.Y.T. Project and mail to:

Dr. William S. Walker
633 Amsterdam Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10024

Sincerely,

William S. Walker, Ph.D.
Social Service Unit

WSW:bec

Dear

We of the R.Y.T. Project have not been in touch with you lately about the loan you received from us after you left the program. We would like to discuss this matter with you at this time.

As you know, when you received the loan, you were told that it should be repaid as soon as possible because the project only had limited funds and wanted to have money available to lend other trainees leaving the program after you. For this reason we are asking that you begin the repayment of your loan.

As of this date (/ /64) you owe the Project the following amount:

_________ which you got in the form of a cash loan

_________ which the Project advanced for your housing

_________ for the dental work done by Dr. Alan Finestein

Of this amount, you have paid _________ leaving an unpaid balance of _________.

Because of a shortage of staff, the Project cannot send a worker around to contact you personally on pay-days as we once did. Therefore, it would be greatly appreciated if you would either bring the amount you wish to pay each pay-day to the Project Field Office at 633 Amsterdam Avenue, New York City, New York or else send a money order payable to the R.Y.T. Project. If you send a money order, address the letter to Dr. William S. Walker, Coordinator of Social Service.

Enclosed you will find a stamped card addressed to the R.Y.T. Project on which you may indicate the way in which you want to repay your loan (by coming to the Field Office or by a money order). There is also a space where the amount you wish to repay each pay-day can be placed.

Thanking you in advance and wishing you continued good fortune, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

William S. Walker,
Coordinator of Social Services
R.Y.T. Project

encl.

SOCIAL AGENCIES CONTACTED BY HYT PROJECT

NAME OF AGENCY	TYPE OF FACILITY	WILLINGNESS TO COOPERATE	DEGREE OF COMMITMENT
1. Bureau of Child Guidance	Public agency - Diagnosis and Treatment of school children and family	Yes	To provide free access to all files for HYT research purposes
2. Board of Education	Educational	Yes	To provide free access to all files and data resources available in Research Division and schools of New York Cit
a) Bureau of Attendance		Yes	" "
b) New York City Schools		Yes	" "
3. ACCEPT (Alcoholism Center Coordinating Education, Prevention and Treatment)	Private voluntary clinic (Experimental)	Yes	To accept HYT referrals for short-term counseling and to refer cases needing long-term intensive treatment
4. Brooklyn Bureau of Social Service	Private voluntary agency to provide psychiatric and psychological services to pre-delinquents and offenders over the age of 16	Yes	Intake restricted to HYT Brooklyn boys not known to other agencies - will give priority to HYT boys who are referred or walk in or telephone the agency. Will give feedback to HYT on boy's status and problems.
5. New York City Department of Welfare	Public assistance agency	Yes	Will provide financial assistance to such eligible HYT trainees as apply. HYT is to provide housing for trainees referred to Welfare. They will provide clothes to HYT boys eligible for assistance, but require boys working to contribute to upkeep of family if living at home.

NAME OF AGENCY	TYPE OF FACILITY	WILLINGNESS TO COOPERATE	DEGREE OF COMMITMENT
6. Jewish Board of Guardians	Private voluntary agency	Yes	Intake restricted to Jewish cases. Area of cooperation with HYT primarily in housing (agency runs a non-sectarian residence club). Agreement pending.
7. National Council of Crime and Delinquency	Private (National Professional Assoc.)	No	Restricted by terms of Federal contract from allowing use of staff time for outside projects, (was willing to cooperate if not for this).
8. Urban League (W. 136th St.)	Private agency (Vocational)	Yes	Will accept job referrals. Will make staff available to HYT on a volunteer basis for follow-up of trainees.
9. Community Service Society	Private volunteer agency	Yes	Accept referrals only if suitable. No relaxation of intake procedures; no provision for quick intake. Made commitment to HYT for information "feedback" on accepted cases.
10. HARYOU	Private research and action program	Yes	Will accept HYT trainees living in HARYOU program area HARYOU "accountability" covers being a supervisory agent and absorbing HYT boys into senior academy and agency according to where living in HARYOU area, with emphasis on vocational training, not schooling.

SOCIAL AGENCIES CONTACTED BY HYT PROJECT (CONTINUED)

	WILLINGNESS TO COOPERATE	DEGREE OF COMMITMENT FOR FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWING
1. B C G	*No	Not asked to perform this function - only asked to supply research data.
2. Board of Education		
a) Bureau of Attendance	*No	Not asked to perform this function.
b) New York City schools	*No	Not asked to perform this function.
3. ACCEPT	*No	Not asked to perform this function.
4. Brookyln Bureau of Social Service	No	Lack of staff and budget
5. N.Y.C. Department of Welfare	No	Lack of staff
6. Jewish Board of Guardians	No	Lack of staff and budget
7. National Council of Crime and Delinquency	No	Restricted by terms of Federal contract.
8. Urban League	Yes	Not a firm commitment, but was willing to ask staff to volunteer.
9. Community Service Society	No	Lack of staff and budget
10. HARYOU	No	Lack of staff and budget.

SOCIAL AGENCIES CONTACTED BY RYT PROJECT (CONTINUED)

NAME OF AGENCY	TYPE OF FACILITY	WILLINGNESS TO COOPERATE	DEGREE OF COMMITMENT
11. Catholic Charities a) Diocese of N.Y.	Private voluntary agency (services to families and individuals)	Yes	Agencies' services limited to clients within archdiocese of New York which includes the boroughs of Bronx, Manhattan and Richmond. Reserve right to refuse cases regarding "Confidentiality", agency will share on-going casework material with RYT. Is not responsible for liaison between themselves and parole regarding cases referred by RYT, but are responsible for "feedback" or information to RYT.
b) Diocese of Brooklyn	Private voluntary agency (services to families and individuals)	Yes	Agenncies' services restricted to RYT referrals residing within archdiocese of Brooklyn, which includes boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens. Reserve right to refuse cases not deemed suitable. Responsible for feedback of information on cases referred by RYT.
12. The Civic Center, Inc.	Private Psychiatric clinic for the rehabilitation of offenders	Yes	Accept RYT referrals from all over New York City for diagnosis and treatment. Will accept drug users for therapy but only RYT trainees living in Brooklyn are eligible to live at lodge - The Civic Center's residential treatment center for drug addic Provisions for quick intake of drug users into group therapy will allow RYT therapists to use Civic Center facilities to continue therapy begun in th institution with trainees.
13. New York City Department of Health (Office of Narcotics Coordinator)	Public - (Specializing in operation of centers for rehabilitation of narcotics users). Also gives consultative service to agencies and individuals. Have central registry of narcotics users.	Yes	(In process of final negotiati Department of Health social workers to act as consultants t RYT cases referred to New York City Parole Division.

NAME OF ~~XXXXXX~~ Agency	TYPE OF FACILITY	WILLINGNESS COOPERATE	DEGREE OF COMMITMENT
14. Young Men's Christian Association of Greater N.Y.	Private agency(Recreation; housing for men and boys; vocational guidance; credit aid, etc. for males).		No commitment. Were seen for information and and written material only.
a) Central Queens branch b) West Side Y M C A		Yes	Accept and provide housing for trainees referred by RYT. Also private space for group meetings.
15. Legal Aid Society	Private agency whose purpose is to render legal aid in the city of N.Y. to persons without adequate means to employ other counsel.		
a) Civil branch		Yes	Accept eligible cases meeting legal aid society's intake criteria. No change of intake procedure for RYT trainees.
b) Criminal Courts branch		Yes	
16. Community Council of Greater N.Y.	Private voluntary, city-wide association of Organizations for the coordination and joint planning of welfare and health services. It is also available for consultation services and assumes the responsibility for gathering and keeping up to date	Yes	Give free access to all data needed by RYT. To help RYT to secure social services from agencies reluctant to service clients from institutions. To act as consultants if needed. Accepted RYT for membership in social service exchange.
~~XX b)~~ a) Social Service Exchange	Coordinate data on services received and prior contacts with social agencies.	Yes	Provide all information known on RYT trainees' prior contacts with social agencies, including the welfare department. To provide supplemental information on the trainees' families.

NAME OF AGENCY	WILLINGNESS TO COOPERATE	DEGREE OF COMMITTMENT FOR FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS
14. YMCA of Greater New York	No*	Not asked to perform this function.
a. Central Queens Branch	No*	Not asked to perform this function. (Only to provide housing).
15. Legal Aid Society		
a. Civil Branch	No*	Not asked to perform this function.
b. Criminal Courts Branch	No*	Not asked to perform this function.
16. Community Council of Greater N.Y.	No*	
a. Social Service Exchange (SSE)	No*	Not asked to perform this function.

NAME OF AGENCY	TYPE OF FACILITY	WILLINGNESS TO COOPERATE	DEGREE OF COMMITTMEMT FOR REFERRALS ONLY
17. New York City Probation Dept. (Family Court) Executive Staff	Public Agency	Yes	Referred Ryt to criminal division of the Probation Dept and made arrangements for meeting.
a. Criminal Division of New York City Parole Dept.	Public Agency	Yes	Gave all information possible to RYT and indicated data sources available since the N.Y. City court reorganization. Offered services as resource and liaison agency to expedite data gathering by RYT research depts.
b. Central Files of N.Y. City Probation Dept.	Public agency - who kept records of probation cases handled by the former Magistrates Court, the former Special Sessions Court, and since XX September, 1962, the records of Current Criminal Court cases.	Yes	Will give RYT any available data in the Central Index's files.

[illegible]

NAME OF AGENCY	WILLINGNESS TO COOPERATE	DEGREES OF COMMITTMENT FOR FOR FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS
17. N.Y. City Probation Dept. (Family Court)	No*	Not asked to perform this function
a. Criminal Division of N.Y. City Parole Dept	No	Lack of budget and staff.
b. Central Files of N.Y. City Probation Dept.	No*	Not asked to perform this function.

27 April 1965

Mr. [redacted]
Director of Personnel
New York Hospital
525 East 68th Street
New York, N. Y. 10021

Dear Sir:

The R.V.T. Project is attempting to re-establish young men who are Youthful Offenders by providing them with a white-collar, middle-class skill in line with the needs of the present day economy. In turn, after successful completion of training, they have the potential for long-term employment, rather than their previous experience in areas offering only short-term work, high turnover, seasonal openings and meager wages.

The selection process has been stringent, based on criterial of intelligence, IBM aptitude, reading level and various personality factors. In addition, supportive services are provided to reinforce success by means of evening classes in remedial reading and self-management.

The technical training extends past the two-month class period, for until a boy returns to the community, he gains unpaid experience in the IBM installation, handling the statistical workloads of the Department of Correction, Parole Commission, Special Sessions and Adolescent Courts. Therefore, a successful graduate is a competent operator.

The boys need work and because of continual rejection, we must seek any and all areas for possible employment. If a youth, eager to work, is considered favorably, he would be very willing to accept employment in any entry-level area. Most of all, these youths need acceptance by a good company which demonstrates its enthusiasm to help a young man who made a mistake and who is never permitted to forget it by the majority of employers.

The cost of maintaining a person in the City's penal system is $6000 yearly. If a youth can be employed, he can succeed and in so doing, become a contributing taxpayer instead of a burden. In many instances, employment also means his family will be no longer dependent upon public assistance.

27 April 1965

Will you consider a young man for a position to let him succeed (or fail) on his own? There is no "risk" involved. You have a complete resume of his background and the boy is aware of this. I shall call for an appointment in order to discuss this in greater depth.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

John J. Cox,
Director
Vocational Placement Unit

JJC:bec

Encl. 1

RYT PROJECT

PROSPECTIVE EMPLOYER DATA AND ATTITUDE SCHEDULE
(Guidelines for Employment Interviewing)

A. Objectives of Employer Contacts

1. To ascertain the extent and characteristics of employment opportunities for RYT trainees.
opp
2. To provide data for ascertaining the degree of employer participation or resistance to the project.

3. To counselors in preparing trainees to meet employer expextations in relation to the above.

B. Form of Interview (s)

The basic technique is a modified open end directed interview combined with closed end factual questions. It is recommended that with top executive or administrative persons that the best approach is the open end technique, with no obvious attempts to direct the course of the interview. Directed closed end questions in general are more suitable for supervisory personnel. The guide comprises two general areas in relation to the preceeding remarks-
1) Questions attempting to focus on management attitudes and
2) eliciting of factual job data and requirements from supervisors.
In reference to the guide questions it would be useful if judgements are made by the interviewer of the degree of interest or involvement generated. Also, indicate, if possible, who the principal respondent is.

C. Program Placement Discussion Guide

1. Proceeding any discussion it is important that a full description is volunteered of the RYT Program, its objectives, methods, support base and characteristics of the trainees. It is important to stress the following points in respect to the RYT program:
   a. The trainees will be carefully selected and counselled. It is our belief that trainees placed on jobs will present problems of no greater range or severity than persons normally recruited.
   b. The employer should feel free to use the same performance and dismissal standards with the trainee as with his other employees. The employer is not committed to ~~xxxxxx~~ retain incompetent help because of his involvement with the program.

2. Ascertain if the firm has had any experience in hiring personnel fitting the RYT trainees.

3. If so, in what categories were they hired, and what has been the firm's experience in relation to their work performance, promotability etc?

3-4 [illegible]

4. What limitations are seen in relation to the use of such personnel?

5. What problems are forseen in relation to hiring such personnel?

6. If specialized problems or difficulties are indicated, how would the employer handle them?

7. What changes or modifications does he suggest that RYT considers in its training program in relation to the facts presented?

8. To what extent would the employer co-operate with RYT in helping the trainee overcome special problems of adjustment?

9. Would the employee be willing to provide additional openings as they occur to RYT TRAINEES, if the performance of original placements is satisfactory?

10. If performance is unsatisfactory would he attempt to place trainee in position more in line with abilities?

11. Whom within the firm will be the responsible liaison with RYT?

D. Description of Firm and Facilities

1. Name of Firm

2. Address

3. Person(s) contacted and titles

4. Principal activity(s) of Firm

5. Principal uses of IBM facilities or departments served

6. Size of installation-list types of equipment and size of staff

7. Standards normally used for selection of IBM personnel

8. Probationary periods for employees

9. Hours of operation

10. Turnover rates by job category
    a. What categories of operator is most needed.
    b. How are they normally recruited.

11. Future potential (is operation contracting, expanding, static) within one year.
    a. If expanding, what additional equipment is contemplated, more advanced, same technical level?
    b. If contracting, what equipment will be eliminated?

12. Preference - men or women operators. For which machines?

Control Group Follow-up Procedures

The control group consisting of a total of 150 subjects screened, tested and selected in cycle groups averaging 30 concomittantly with their Experimental counterparts, will be followed-up by using procedures and data collection methods, listed below:

1. While each cycle group is at Rikers Island, a list of their names will be checked at two week intervals in order to ascertain their current status with respect to parole date vs. actual release date, transfers, and changes in status because of conduct. This will be done by contacting the parole officer assigned to Rikers Island and/or appropriate Correction Department staff at two week intervals on a continuing basis until all youth in the control groups have been discharge.

2. After release, total of five follow-up contacts[1] will be implemented:

    a) first contact - one month after release;

    b) second contact - three months after release (i.e., two months after the first contact);

    c) third contact - six months after release (three months after the second contact);

    d) fourth contact - nine months after release (six months after the third contact);

---

[1] By "contact" is meant that parole records will be examined, not that the boy himself will be interviewed. The exception will be those youths not on parole; these will be contacted by R.Y.T. staff for direct interviewing.

e) Fifth contact - twelve months after release (three months after the fourth contact);

f) sixth contact - eighteen months after release (six months after the fifth contact)

3. The possibility always exists that during this eighteen month period after release, the youth may get into trouble or undergo some crisis in his life. Procedures will be set up whereby the R. Y. T. Project will be informed automatically by the New York City Parole Commission, Department of Correction, Social Service Exchange, or Court dealing with the case as well as its disposition, in the event the youth gets into trouble.

4. There will be not interventio by R. Y. T. for the control group in terms of programming, training or treatment, nor will there be any planned-for direct contacts with them after release.

With the permission and under the guidance of the Parole Commission, a designated staff member from R. Y. T. will examine the boy's folders at 100 Centre Street in order to obtain selected information. This information will be recorded on a schedule specially designed for this purpose. This will cover such data as First Job Status; Subsequent Job Changes - Changes in the Home Situation and Marital Status - Return to School for Academic or other Training - Emergent or Current Problems - Current Recommendations of the Parole Officer, e.g., his evaluation of the boy, frequency of reporting.

Parole Commission records will be supplemented by information gathered from other City social agencies in order to get a complete picture of the boy. The Parole Commission

will be consultated in order to implement the above procedures within their filing system and operational procedure.

Treatment Group Follow-up Procedure - R.Y.T. Project.

The treatment group consisting of a total of 150 subjects screened, tested and selected in cycle groups of 30, together with their counterparts (R.Y.T. Project Control Group members), will be followed up in accordance with the procedures and data collection methods listed below.

1. Periodic checks regarding each trainee's parole status will be made with the Parole Commission during each two month training cycle.

2. According to Institutional Order No. 12 issued by the Warden, Henry J. Noble, "two weeks before the completion of the training program,.......the R.Y.T. Administration will submit to the Parole Commissioner through the Warden, a complete evaluation report on each inmate assigned to the course. The Warden will endorse each report, prior to forwarding it to the Parole Commission".

3. With the cooperation of the Parole Commission, efforts will be made to secure the release of trainees as soon after completion of the training cycle as possible. In accordance with the aforementioned Institutional Order No. 12, selection of the trainee for the cycle will take into account his expected release date. The following excerpt establishes the policy: "No definite sentence case will be accepted for training if the inmate has more than one week to serve after the completion of the training cycle, and no indeterminate sentence case will be accepted for training unless the Parole Commission has indicated that the inmate will be eligible for parole consideration two weeks after the completion of the

training cycle"

4. With the permission and supervision of the Parole Commission, and in like manner to the procedure for control subjects, a R.Y.T. staff member will examine the records of paroled trainees at 100 Centre Street. Such examinations will be made in accordance with the following schedule:

a) first contact - one month after release;

b) second contact - three months after release (i.e., two months after first contact);

c) third contact - six months after release (three months after second contact).

5. In addition to the periodic review of parole progress, R.Y.T. staff members will undertake to provide, in cooperation with several community agencies, follow-up casework counseling for each trainee. Interviews with each trainees's family will also be scheduled.

In this manner, paroled trainees will have access in the critical post-release period to an additional supportive and counseling agent that ordinarily might not be available. Close liaison between the designated R.Y.T. social worker (who may be the representative of an agency community) and the parole officer would be most useful. It is anticipated that R.Y.T. follow-up services will continue for about six months after release, perhaps somewhat longer for trainees in the early training cycle.

6. In the event a R.Y.T. trainee gets into further difficulty with the law on a new

offense or violation of parole after his release from Rikers Island, he will be interviewed as soon as possible after R. Y. T. has received this information from "feedback" sources. The original schedule of post-institutional follow-up/aftercare interviews will be adjusted accordingly.

7. In such cases as the above, as well as those where R.Y.T. is informed or detects that a trainee is undergoing a crisis or series of crises in his personal life, further services to the extent needed to resolve such problems will be given by R.Y.T. directly or by referral to the appropriate agency.

37

19 February 1969

Mr. Edgar Busby
Supervising Psychiatric Social Worker
Civic Center Clinic, Inc.
44 Willoughby Street
Brooklyn 1, New York

Dear Mr. Busby:

In accordance with the agreement between the RYT Project and Civic Center Clinic, Inc., I am referring one of our trainees to you for treatment.

Enclosed you will find various types of background information on the youth covering various periods and inter-personal relationships, etc. If I can be of any further service to you in this matter, please let me know.

Thank you for accepting our client and for the consideration you have shown us.

Sincerely yours,

William S. Walker, Ph.D.
Social Service Coordinator

WSW:bea

encl.

[redacted]

Family Relationship

who is a troubled and somewhat anxious youth, is under great pressure at home and relationships there are such that they arouse anxiety and hostility in him as he feels he has low status in the family circle. His elder brothers, who is his full brother (the other sibs are said to be half-brothers and sisters), also has low status in the family.

To illustrate, reaction to any relationships with his mother and sisters is colored by his feeling that they to dominate and downgrade him. He feels that the older sister looks down on him because she has more education than he. She finished high school while he and his older brother did not. Moreover, he claims the mother and sister tell him that he isn't doing anything for the family, that he is stupid like his older brother (who is married), that they are failures. This youth seems to have little or no ego as he feels he is being systematically chopped down and castrated at home.--He has also lacked a suitable male role model in his home environment.

Maturity

He seems to be rather immature and not yet to have established a normal pattern of heterosexual relationships, e.g., regular dating, etc.

Drinking

drinks and even gets high occasionally, but it is the impression of our worker that drinking is not a problem for him. However, his attitude toward himself and life is a problem for him. He feels that life has passed him by, and that he is ineffectual and doomed to failure. He sees himself as a born loser.

Post-Institutional Education

is a school drop-out (only completing the eighth grade) and up to now any attempt to get him to complete his education has failed. This ties in with this insecure youth's feeling that he can never get enough education and/or training to make up for his lack of schooling. He acquired this feeling early in his school career when finding school becoming more and more difficult and himself dropping farther and farther behind, he went to the street as an easy way out.

Since leaving Riker's Island, this pattern of not following through is again apparent. For example, this past summer, he dropped out of key punch school to which he had a free scholarship. Subsequent to this, last September, he was taking a couple of courses and dropped them. Currently, is going to school two nights a week, taking English and typing. However is woefully deficient in his reading ability and needs to be placed in a remedial reading class.

393

Centri

26 April 1965

Mr. John J. Quinn
Chairman
New York City Parole Commission
100 Centre Street
New York, New York 10013

Dear Sir:

This letter of appeal is written in behalf of a young man who successfully completed the RVT Program and returned to the community, under your jurisdiction, on 21 December 1964.

Approximately three weeks later, the Vocational Placement Unit of this Project secured a clerical position for him at the Security Mutual Insurance Company. has performed in an exemplary manner in this position. The company's personnel records show that his attendance, punctuality, cooperation, personal appearance and work output were rated as either "Good" or "Excellent". His immediate supervisor, unaware of background, indicates that he is "one of the best boys who ever worked for her."

was recently hospitalized for a short while. His fellow employees voluntarily contributed over $100 in his behalf during his hospitalization.

During his recuperative period, was arrested on charges which were ultimately dismissed. However, the Department of Correction returned him to Riker's Island as a Parole Violator because of the Commission's warrant, which was not revoked when the charges were dismissed.

The Automatic Warrant issured when a parolee is arrested, I'm sure has received much deliberation in your department. I feel in this parolee's case it should receivedspecial attention. has indicated an exceptionally good rehabilitative record. His current employer is willing to hold his job open for him if he can be returned within the next ten days.

In light of his good readjustment and the likelihood that further imprisonment will do noting but debilitate the parolee further, I should appreciate if you would review this situation and determine if his immediate return to the community is feasible.

Sincerely,

Arno Safier
Project Director

AS:bac

APPENDIX E

A WORKING PAPER ON SOURCES OF JOB ASPIRATION AND JOB CHOICE

A consistent plan to change socially deviant behavior implies an underlying frame of reference for "understanding" the evolution of unwanted behavior, and an organizing set of concepts to help determine goals and prescribe activities required to bring about change. In corrections, such frames of reference generally have remained implied. However, if better solutions are to be developed, it is necessary to try to be explicit about the hunches, intuitions and hypotheses which lie behind intervention in the lives of inmates.

The fluid society of our days creates a tremendous range for individual choice of role in life. Continual responsibility for making decisions and personal responsibility for the outcomes of decisions are put upon the individual in modern society. Many persons are unprepared to accept such responsibility and many are ill-equipped to handle the stresses which are generated. Often all the alternatives seem to be miserable choices.

In modern America the individual is supposed to remain "civilized" and conforming, while simultaneously seeking his own particular function and role. He is expected to be somewhat self-centered and in the midst of changing social patterns and fluctuating standards of general society, is expected to develop a private responsibility system which takes care of his own needs and also ensures a minimum of disturbance to others.

It is fortunate that most people manage to live within these limits. Those who succeed are considered "acceptable", largely because they do not disturb dominant habits and mores in today's manner of living. In primitive cultures the nonconformist was killed or cast out. In modern society, judgment about deviancy is deferred and conformity is presumed until an overt act threatens the security of others in society. Then the jail may be used to produce adherence to socially acceptable norms or as a place of exile.

As long as the number of deviants stigmatized and put into cold storage remained small, the cost to "normal" society was reckoned as not worth noticing. It was as if society felt that it could afford to incarcerate and forget deviants if the numbers were too few to exert a marked influence on the social structure. The ancient dictum of "an eye for an eye" could legitimize incarceration as deserved punishment and retribution. Today, however, the number of offenders flowing in and out of jails and prisons is large and costly. The basic threat to society isn't much different than before... it is just that it has become expensive and threatens the social fabric because of its size. As a result, simple

(3 ½)

containment of the problem is no longer universally approved as a solution and many sectors of society now call for more effective ways of protecting the community from dangerous deviants.

Current knowledge and programs do not promise easy success. Basic information and resources which long have been needed are still not available. Serious deficiencies exist in knowledge, personnel, programs and facilities.

No single physical condition, personality organization, or psycho-social circumstance can be demonstrated to lead inevitably to criminal behavior. However, certain recurrent types of personal and social organization, within the context of certain cultural settings and specific provocative circumstances do tend to produce criminal behavior. Some groups and individuals have been identified as more vulnerable to criminal patterns of adjustment, and hence, more likely to be exposed to frequent contact with police, courts, and correctional agencies. Frequent interaction with social agencies dealing with criminals, and consequent closer relationships with other people in trouble tend to reinforce social and self-identification as a criminal. Sub-cultural groups (e.g., the street-corner society) where norms support criminal solutions for human problems and provocative conditions which act as "triggers" for criminality (e.g., intensified competition for social status within a restrictive social structure) also have been identified in various studies. Thus, certain vulnerable people under given circumstances of stress regularly will choose criminal behavior as the most feasible alternative of those which appear to be available. This choice is not inevitable. Since the behavior which brings the usual offender into court and jail is learned, it can be unlearned. Principles of unlearning and re-learning can be applied to modify these patterns of response and adjustment. Alternative solutions can be developed.

The tools and techniques used by RYT in approaching these problems were not strikingly new. The unique feature was that RYT proposed to reduce criminality by developing a new role and function for the jail. When dealing with legal offenders, jails have certain distinct advantages over other correctional services and educational influences in society. Public administrators and correctional personnel should be keenly aware of such advantages and should be prepared to use them. Unfortunately, at the present time, in most parts of the country, these advantages are misused and utterly wasted. The jail is obviously a logical place to try to prevent recidivism.

1. It has access to 80% of the adults in our society who are likely to be apprehended for felonious crimes.

2. It is in contact with many criminals relatively early in the development of their criminal career and at a time when they may be more malleable.

3. The jail has unique opportunities to make controlled observations of the adult offender while he is working, playing, learning and living closely with others.

4. The jail has fairly extensive control over the life-space of the inmate. It can reduce the ease with which the offender uses illegitimate means to achievement of his ends and can create circumstances to stimulate and reward the use of capacities for acceptable social performance.

5. The jail controls the major inputs to social relationships of stress and help. Change in human behavior generally is related to perception of stress - timing and direction of change are often determined by perception of help. The jail has unusual capacities for creating stress. Paradoxically, it is also the major helping agency available to the inmate. If jail personnel are aware of the dynamics of this situation and are provided an adequate rationale for utilizing its potential, the jail could become a powerful influence for constructive change in the lives of inmates and in its contribution to the community.

6. The jail has a strong, though largely unrealized, potential because it is a local agency. It occupies a strategic position with regard to the community. Most prisons for convicted felons are quite distant from the community to which the offender must return. In contrast, the jail can keep the community involved in the correctional process and can provide for a more appreciative and controlled re-entry to the community after incarceration.

7. While the jail has relatively little control over the time of release, it can selectively manage its own release procedures. It can develop a capacity for releasing prisoners in ways that are designed to prevent a return to recidivism and which foster a successful interaction with the general stream of social activity.

President Johnson, in his message to Congress in March 1964 said: "We cannot tolerate an endless, self-defeating cycle of imprisonment, release and reimprisonment, which fails to alter undesirable attitudes and behavior. We must find ways to help the first offender avoid a continuing career of crime...Reducing the total volume of crime is, to a large extent, a problem of reducing the rate of recidivism."

A major premise in the RYT study is that an offender who can be helped to establish a self-regulated performance in a work role which is satisfying to him and to society has the basis for leading a socially acceptable non-criminal life. Other factors may overwhelm the security and satisfactions derived from this role and may lead to deviance. But without a satisfactory work role the adult male in our society is doomed to a life of social deviance, criminality or mental illness.

Obviously, simply finding work for someone cannot be equated with the objective of producing and maintaining a self-regulated performance in an acceptable work role. Unfortunately, however, such a simple goal frequently has been established as the operational definition of satisfactory adjustment in employment programs for deviant and disadvantaged populations.

Preparing youth for work is a complex undertaking. Work cannot have a socializing effect unless it enables the individual to satisfy his inclinations and interests, and unless it offers the place he seeks in society. Shaping competence and motivation to work cannot be accomplished by improving the quality of skill training alone.

The experience of the present study illustrates some of the difficulties. When an attempt was made to do something more than provide a way of simply occupying an individual's time and getting pay for it, it became clear that the subjects were:

1. Ambivalent about aspiring to a new work role and identification.
2. They were brittle and easily shattered by the flow of work and social demands in ordinary work settings.
3. They had deeply entrenched psychological defenses and adjustment techniques which were handicapping in the personal-social reorganization required for self-regulated performance.
4. They returned to family and friendship patterns which reinforced older self-concepts and hindered the development of new perceptions and adjustments.

Some writers have said that these boys are not motivated. The RYT experience, however, indicates that it may not be so much a matter of motivation as lack of self-confidence and willingness to risk the losses and stress that can occur as a result of radical shifts in social roles. For example, one of the initial surprises for RYT job placement staff was

(40)

that subjects who were interested, enthusiastic and successful during the training phases, were distinctly reluctant and apparently unmotivated to seek jobs in data processing after release. One such boy who had been given a $500 scholarship by a private technical school to continue study, suddenly stopped going to the school and didn't tell anyone about it. Later, in the follow-up interview, he said simply, "...I was scared...of the teacher and everybody...I didn't think I was going to make it." Yet the recollection by the school was that he was doing reasonably well. The young adult who has no feeling of mastery and competence is not likely to appear motivated.

There are also other attitudes which generate the same effect. Another trainee commented, "I'd get to wondering how many of them knew about my record..." The problems of transition which are implied in this expression of anxiety are potent factors in the work situation which reduce comfort, concentration and effectiveness. The dynamics appear to be very much like those facing a minority group person, who is shifting to an integrated work setting. Of course, if the youth in question happens to be a member of a racial minority, as was true for many RYT subjects, there are added preoccupations.

In commenting upon such problems of transition, Kenneth Clark observes:

(413)

> There are profound human problems involved in progressing from a racially segregated to a non-segregated society. The invisible walls of a segregated society are not only damaging but protective in a debilitating way. There is a considerable psychological safety in the ghetto; there one lives among one's own and does not risk rejection among strangers. Some Negroes prefer to stay in the ghetto, particularly those who have developed seemingly effective defenses to protect themselves against hurt...Most Negroes take the first step into an integrated society tentatively and torn with conflict; he is confronted with his own inner anxieties, conflicts and challengers, as he dares to move into a society of open competition.[1]

> It has been charged...that Negro youth lack motivation to succeed. To the extent that this is true it is largely a consequence of ghetto psychology...Negroes often dread to try for jobs where Negroes have never worked before...Negroes have had traumatic experiences in seeking employment.[2]

Even when placement has been accomplished and the work activities and the job itself are interesting to the lower-class youth, he must contend with people on the job, particularly supervisors who may disapprove of behavior he has learned, which is acceptable in his home environment. Thus, when one of the RYT trainees was pressed for an explanation of why he had left an IBM job for a series of low paying, short-term jobs he made the following comment as part of his explanation: "Well...I have this walk...kind of a swinging walk like...and my supervisor, she didn't like it...she didn't want me to do it when I took things to other departments."

---

[1] Clark, Kenneth B. Dark Ghetto, Harper & Row, New York 1965, p. 19.

[2] Ibid, p. 38.

> The corner boy...quickly senses that he is under the critical surveillance of people who are foreigners to his community and who appraise him in terms of values which he does not share. To win the favor of the people in charge he must change his habits, his values, his ambitions, his speech and his associates. Even were these things possible, the game might not be worth the candle. So having sampled what they have to offer, he returns to the streets or to his clubhouse in a cellar where facilities are meager but human relations more satisfying.[3]

Also to be considered is the fact that punched card data processing work was not as prestigeful in the boys eyes as had been hoped. Part of the reason for this was that in many of entry level jobs they were competing with women and were supervised by women. Within the potency-ideology of some of these young men such competition was emasculating. They felt that the field had been misrepresented to them.

Moreover, the success-models and admired figures of lower-class boys often are adults who have achieved success through illegitimate means. The routine of both middle and working-class jobs are scorned by some of these "heroes", and it is these figures that young offenders may aspire to emulate rather than middle-class adults. In this context Cloward and Ohlin note that:

> The lower-class is not without its own distinctive and indigenous illegitimate success-models. Many accounts of the literature suggest that lower-class adults who have achieved success by illegitimate means not only are highly visible to young people in slum areas but often are willing to establish intimate relationships with these youth. Just

> as the middle class youth...may aspire to become a policy king: "I want to be a big shot...have all the guys look up to me. Have a couple of Lincolns. Lots of broads, and all the coppers licking my shoes."[3]

Job Aspiration and its Sources

Surprisingly, despite the many programs and projects to increase employment among youth, there are few that have made any attempt to study the bases for job choice among boys of the lowest socio-economic and disadvantaged groups. For example, Herman and Sadofsky, in their review of Youth-Work Programs make the following observation:

> Disadvantaged youth tend to be inexperienced in the world of work. They are also said to be unmotivated in respect to unemployment and, like most adolescents, generally unstable and impatient with tasks that are not "fun" or that are too demanding. It seems reasonable to expect, therefore, that after two or three years of experience, programs attempting to increase employment among such youth will be in a position to specify...occupations in which they expect to place youngsters, with supporting data describing both the vocational interests of youth and the jobs which are likely to be available...
>
> During the interviews, however, executives tended to define the types of employment their program sought for youth in terms of characteristics of a "good" job...
>
> Job security, opportunity for advancement, and a living wage were emphasized by many executives. Presumably, however, these criteria are valued somewhat differently according to social class, age, sex, race and education of the perceiver.

---

[3] Cloward, Richard & Ohlin, Lloyd, "Types of Delinquent Subcultures", Readings in Juvenile Delinquency, J. B. Lippencott Co., New York, 1964, p. 91.

1155

> How does the disadvantaged youth perceive a "good" job? What kinds of job interest him? What will he accept? And, on the other hand, what is actually available to him? To these questions the youth-work programs have produced few answers.[4]

There are several excellent studies of aspiration and sources of job choices among high school graduates and college students. While these studies are not directly applicable because of social-cultural differences they are helpful in developing hypotheses.

Ginzberg and his associates, who have done the major portion of work in this field, identify three basic features in the process:

> *First*, occupational choice is a *developmental process*. It is not based on a single decision, but on a series of decisions made over a period of years. Each step in the process has a meaningful relation to those which precede and follow it.
>
> *Second*, the process is largely irreversible, since *each* decision is dependent on the chronological age and development of the individual. Time cannot be relived nor development reversed. The individual can make new decisions and often does shift even after tentative commitment to a particular choice. But, later decisions must take earlier decisions into account, and hence, are limited by them.

---

[4] Herman, Melvin and Sadofsky, Stanley, *Youth-Work Programs, Problems of Planning and Operation*, Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University, New York, 1966. pp. 34-35

Third, vocational choices inevitably represent a compromise. If vocational choice could be based on a single element such as interest or capacity and if such factors as job market, income structure, and social prestige could be ignored, then the process of deciding could be simple and direct. However, a series of factors, both internal and external, affect each youth's decision. Conflicts will be encountered and some satisfactions must be set aside in favor of achieving others. The individual must find a balance among the many personal and social elements. Hence, most occupational choices are compromises.

Ginzberg suggests that there are three phases in the process of occupational decision-making: there is a fantasy period, a tentative period, and a realistic period.

The fantasy period, generally emerges between the ages of 6 and 11. Youngsters tend to think about occupation in general terms and in terms of their wish to be an adult. With limited knowledge of reality, the child cannot assess his capacities or opportunities accurately. He believes he can be whatever he wants to be. His verbalized choices are arbitrary, without reference to reality, and differ according to his culture and environment.

The phase of tentative choice is ushered in with the development of a new attitude toward one's self. As the child begins to see himself as an entity which is both stable and changing, he becomes increasingly aware that he must evaluate himself is he is to direct his activities effectively toward his goals.

With regard to an analysis of a disadvantaged group such as the jail population it should be recognized that the interests, awareness of capacities, values and the understanding of opportunity which are present in adolescence will vary greatly depending on the socio-cultural background of the individuals involved.

Ginsburg describes the final period in the process of occupational decision making as a reality period. In the preceding phases the young person is largely preoccupied with subjective elements. In this phase, however, the young adult tends to try to balance his basic values and interests and capacities in the best compromise he can work out in the reality of the world of work available to him.

40

In the last analysis the choice of an occupation is a compromise in which the individual seeks to gain the most satisfaction out of his working life. He attempts to choose a career which will make the most use of his interests and capacities in a situation which will satisfy his values and goals. In seeking an appropriate choice he must weigh the actual realities of opportunity and personal and social limitation. In a sense the process is always a compromise between self-interest and reality.

As we have seen the information which is available about occupations varies greatly at different socio-economic levels. From the material available to us in RYT and from literature which bears on this general problem of vocational adjustment in the delinquent population we get information that suggests that young adults in jail may be fixated at various of these developmental levels suggested by Ginsburg and do not move on to later stages in the progression he suggests. For example, in interviews with RYT subjects there were some who appeared to be unable to move beyond the fantasy stage. Some other studies lend support to this observation. The absence of fathers during the early years of adolescence also creates a circumstance which has been suggested by other social scientists as having an effect on perceptions of work-role. An extensive literature has been surveyed and may be fitted within the frame of reference suggested here.